43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

- Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. The Chaplain for today is Reverend Lowell C. Hayes, of the Lawrence Avenue Church of Christ in Springfield. Reverend Hayes is the guest of Representative Curran."
- Reverend Hayes: "God, Our Father in Heaven, Your word teaches us to pray for those who are in higher powers. We come doing that very thing this afternoon, recognizing You as the Power above all Powers and the Authority above Authorities. They face a difficult task, and we ask that You might be with them. The troubles and opportunities that face our state and our nation are many. Our economy, we face some tough decisions; educational systems, community problems, all of these things are challenge, but we believe that with Your help and quidance that decisions can be made that are going to be beneficial to our state as a whole. So we ask that You might give these men and women wisdom for their work today. Help them with the resources, for the responsibilities that they have. Give them compassion for what conflicts there are, and give them direction for their decisions. Help them to see just as we are one nation under God, so are we one Different people, but one state, different communities, but one state. We pray that You will there be unity, that our state might be strong and mighty in the days ahead. In Jesus' name. Amen."
- Speaker McPike: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Deering."
- Deering et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, let the record reflect the excused absence of Monroe Flinn due to his injuries."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect the excused absence of Representative Barnes due to illness."

Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Representative Young, if you could...Take the record, Mr. Clerk. 116 Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. Representative Satterthwaite in the Chair."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "If we may have attention of the Members, please. We have some special guests to introduce. We have with us today University of Illinois Trustee Ken Boyle, and we have also with us today the athletic director of the University of Illinois, John Mackovic. I'll turn the podium over to him. He promises us not more than one hour of dissertation, but he will be here to meet with you individually out in the back hall after he has a few words for us. Director Mackovic."

Mackovic: "Thank you. Good afternoon. It's my pleasure. This is my first opportunity since being at Illinois to be down here with this group, but I'm very pleased to do that. We're on our spring caravan, and we'll be meeting with many of our alums and contributors later in the day as we travel around the state. I know many of you have opportunities to come to Champaign to see our teams participate. We greatly appreciate the support of everyone here and throughout our state. It's my pleasure being with you today."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "...may have the attention of Members, please. We are going to the Order of State and Local Government, Second Reading, and the first several Sponsors on that list are Wolf, Balanoff, and Brunsvold. If they will please be ready to have their Bills called, we will

- 43rd Legislative Day May 2, 1991 start with House Bill 391, Representative Wolfe. Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 391, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No
 Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Madam Speaker, I just wanted the Bill read for a second time, and then held on Second."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Okay. We'll hold the Bill on Second
 Reading at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 760,
 Representative Balanoff. Is the Gentleman present? Out of
 the record. House Bill 832, Representative Brunsvold. Mr.
 Clerk. read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 832, a Bill for an Act to amend various Acts in relation to riverboat gambling. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Myron Olson."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Olson. Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Myron Olson,
 Representative Olson is on his way to the floor. If we
 could ask the Chair's indulgence, or if you'd be kind
 enough to let me handle the Amendment for him."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "At the request of the Sponsor, we'll take the Bill out of the record."
- Black: "Thank you very much."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "House Bill 1078...Out of the record.

 House Bill 1079, Representative Madigan. Out of the

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

record. House Bill 1113, Representative Giorgi. Do you wish the Bill called on Second Reading? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1113, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
Myron Olson."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Olson. Representative Giorgi, what is your wish?"

- Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, I've spoken with Representative Olson on his Amendment. What my Bill does, and my Amendment, it allows the Greater Rockford Airport to execute a quick-take claim on property that has to do with extending the Greater Rockford Airport. His Amendment would be ideal an Amendment in another situation, but it wouldn't fit in my Bill because the people involved in the quick-take have agreed to have their property taken over by the airport, but there's one property owner that wants to negotiate. They can't negotiate, they're going to end up in court, anyway. His provides for a referendum, and I've talked to him about it. Ordinarily I'd support him, but in this case, his referendum is out of place on this Bill, like to let the leaders on the other side present his Amendment and then take a vote on it."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Black, are you prepared to handle the Amendment?"
- Black: "I appreciate the Sponsor's indulgence, and I'd be more than pleased to handle the Amendment for Representative Olson."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Olson: "Good. Go ahead."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Proceed, please."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Amendment #2 simply requires approval by referenda of the electors within the Greater Rockford Airport Authority to extend the quick—take powers of eminent domain. Probably an Amendment that I think most people would agree with, giving them a greater say—so in the process of quick—take. I think the Sponsor of the Bill has indicated that he is not in agreement with this Amendment, but we would ask for your favorable consideration of Amendment #2."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Giorgi."

- Giorgi: "Had this been a situation where you could go into a referendum process, at the present time, the Federal Government has a contract with the Greater Rockford Airport Authority, and if they don't get their house in order, the money from the Federal Government won't approve the Rockford Airport Authority. They have a June deadline, and I've spoken with Mr. Olson on the Amendment, and in this case it's not timely, so I'd like the Members on my side of the aisle to vote 'no' on this Amendment."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "You have heard the Motion by
 Representative Black to adopt on Amendment #2. All in
 favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it, and the
 Amendment fails.
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading, Mr. Clerk. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments"
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 1538,
 Representative Marinaro. Out of the record. House Bill
 1584, Representative Young. Out of the record. House Bill
 1587, Representative Lou Jones. Out of the record. House
 Bill 1699, Representative Santiago. Out of the record.

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

House Bill 1700, Representative Santiago. Out of the record. House Bill 1715, Representative Keane. Out of the record. House Bill 1776, Representative Curran. Is the Gentleman...do you wish us to proceed with the Bill, Representative? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1776, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Labor Equity Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed, and fiscal note is now filed."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any other Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. Representative Giorgi on House Bill 1871. Representative Black."

Black: "Madam Speaker, excuse me, but my light was on on that Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "I'm sorry, I did in fact have the Calendar over your light."

Black: "Alright, let me...we had filed a fiscal note on that Bill, and we didn't hear, has it indeed been filed?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Clerk indicated that the fiscal note has been filed."

Black: "We do not have a copy, and that's why I was asking you. Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Giorgi, on House Bill 1871. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1871, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Horse Racing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Ryder."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, I would ask that Floor Amendment #1 be withdrawn."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #1."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "I also wish to withdraw #2."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Withdraw Amendment #2. Further
Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would wish to speak to Floor Amendment #3. The underlying Bill requires a ratio of paramutuel clerks for automatic teller machines, and it is an attempt to regulate the industry by requiring these folks to be hired. However, it's my understanding that the paramutuel clerks have just signed an agreement in which they have agreed to work for 90 dollars a day. Since we're regulating the number of clerks to be hired, which I personally think is an invasion of the horse race industry, but I think it's only fair that we also regulate what they've just agreed to, which is the 90 dollars a day. And that's the reason for the Floor Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, I think that Amendment is tongue-in-cheek by Representative Ryder. I've seen his antics on the Appropriations Committee today also, but he's not certainly one to bring in labor negotiations into the General Assembly of Springfield. It would be sacrilegious on his part. That's a separate negotiation. It's a negotiated item. What you're talking about is unconstitutional, bringing the issue on the Assembly floor. Do you want to

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

negotiate all of the contracts? We don't have time for these histrionic games."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. In direct answer question, of the Sponsor of the underlying Bill. don't want to negotiate the number of people that you're demanding to be placed in each of these facilities. the one with the underlying Bill that's bringing the If the paramutuel clerks wanted to take negotiations here. in the process, they just negotiated their own They should have put it in there; they didn't, contract. they've come down here with this Bill, it's fair, if you believe that...you should be able to negotiate the then it's fair that we should be able to put a price tag on them. Neither of these things should before the General Assembly. Both of them should be negotiated between labor and management. That's the reason that the Amendment should be part of the Bill; that's reason that it's being proposed."

Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, if the Sponsor of the Amendment would have availed himself of the information available, he wouldn't come up with this Amendment. The reason this Amendment is on this Bill, is because the track owner won't respond to the employees because of too many shut—offs. People are going to the paramutuel windows and there aren't enough people to take their bets. Time isn't enough so they're using machines to help...so that the State of Illinois gets more of their cut of the paramutuel gross. That's the reason for the Amendment. Had you availed yourself of the information, you wouldn't introduce this stupid Amendment."

Ryder: "I'd certainly like a Roll Call, and I agreed for suggesting that, but allow me to suggest in closing, if I

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

may, Madam Speaker, to this Amendment. I agree that there may be some disagreement between the paramutuel clerks and the racing industry on this. It's the racing board that disagrees with your position, Representative. The racing board doesn't agree that there's that problem. I'd like to have as much of that money as we could. But if you're going to come down and regulate the number of people to be employed, then we ought to regulate what they be paid."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 on House Bill 1871. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue there are 45 voting 'yes', 61 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Ryder."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Lang, for what reason do
 you arise?"
- Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Is this Amendment printed and distributed?"
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "It's indicated that the Amendments 4, 5, and 6 which have been filed have not been printed and circulated. What is your wish, Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Well, Madam Speaker, inasmuch as he wasn't a Gentleman about this past Amendment by not notifying me and talking to me about the problem with the Amendment, I don't want to accept his 3, 4, and 5, so I move to table his Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "4, 5, and 6 I believe are the numbers." Giorgi: "4, 5, and 6."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Are all of those Representative Ryder's

 Amendments, or who Sponsored those Amendments, Clerk?"

 Giorgi: "They're nuisance Amendments."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Clerk O'Brien: "All spornsored by Representative Ryder."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman's Motion is to table Amendments 4, 5, and 6 on House Bill 1871. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendments are tabled.

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments.

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. We'll go back now to House Bill 760, Representative Balanoff. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 760, a Bill for an Act relating to the State Board of Higher Eduction. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Giglio."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Amendment # does, #1 does is allows the people of House. the townships to dissolve township government and whereby all the property and all the holdings of the township would to the county. What has happened, and a lot of people are concerned that their tax dollars are being used for a government that really is a duplication of services. You know, township government was great back a hundred years ago when there was nobody being able to get to the county seat, but in this day and age, especially in Cook County, now that we have mini-centers all over the county, county government has come out to the suburbs and they have come out to the township. If you look at your tax bill, some of your tax bills are higher than what you pay for the library Ladies and Gentlemen, this just gives people an opportunity to express themselves, and I would ask for your

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

favorable support or answer any questions if I may."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Inquiry of the Chair, Madam Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair. Has this Amendment been printed and distributed?"
Speaker Satterthwaite: "Mr. Clerk, has the Amendment been printed

and distributed? He indicated that it has been printed and distributed. Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Madam Speaker, to the Amendment, I would just stand in opposition to this Amendment. For those of you who not heard the explanation, what this particular Amendment would do, would be to allow a referendum to abolish township government. Now, that in itself is obviously a very, very controversial idea. My opposition to Amendment is not based necessarily on that particular position, but the Bill that we have, House Bill 760 with Representative Balanoff and I, is a controversial enough Bill without adding this car to a truck...train that's going to be tough to pull in the first place. I would oppose this Amendment because it will detract from the Bill, and I would like to have a vote on the Bill itself rather than on this particular Amendment. So I would stand in opposition to this Amendment, and would hope that all my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle and those on the Democratic side of the aisle would oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I heard the ruling of the
Chair that the Amendment was printed and distributed. We
don't have a copy of it over here at all, so that we could
take a look at it, if the Sponsor could pull this out of
the record for a minute until we could find it, locate a
copy of that Amendment, we'd appreciate it."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "We'd ask you to check with your Republican Pages to see if they have distributed it, but it has been distributed we're told."

Wennlund: "No. They indicate they have not."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "We are told that the Amendment has been given to the Republican Pages, so I would suggest you check to see what has happened to them on your side of the aisle."

Wennlund: "They've checked both, and indicate that they do not have a copy of the Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Yes. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

McNamara: "On this Amendment, this is a permissive by referendum of the people only, is that correct?"

Giglio: "That's correct. Only in counties over a million. It doesn't affect the downstate counties and the townships downstate."

McNamara: "It only affects Cook county, then?"

Giglio: "I believe Cook county is the only county in the state that has over a million people, yes."

McNamara: "Okay. So, these people, when presented this referendum, will have the option to either include or exclude that form of government and especially in areas where there are large populations and that government may be duplicative, both sides can present their case. Is that correct to the referendum?"

Giglio: "That's correct."

McNamara: "Thank you very much."

Giglio: "Permissive."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Amendment, because this Amendment doesn't pertain to the spirit of the

43rd Legislative Day

- May 2, 1991
- goal of this Bill, and I would ask Members on both sides of the aisle to please vote 'no' on Amendment #1."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Wennlund, have you found a copy of the Amendment?"
- Wennlund: "No, we've not. The Pages are unable to even locate a copy of the Amendment. At this point in time, I would raise a parliamentary question with respect to germaneness to the existing Bill, but we can't tell because we haven't seen the Amendment yet."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Mr. Clerk, may we see the Bill? The ruling of the Parliamentarian is that the Amendment is germane. They both deal with local governments, and they both deal with abolishing a local position. Representative Wojcik."
- Wojcik: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I just perused the Amendment and I'm really shocked with the Sponsor on the other side of the aisle that he would try to abolish township government, especially in the county that we both reside in. As an ex-township clerk of 14 years, and knowing the government that's been the closest to the people and has provided services for the people, I find it very shocking that this should be a suggestion. I'll tell you something, if it wasn't for township government, you would not be able to handle local elections today because as a township clerk, that's what we did for the people in the county, and to abolish this and abolish the services locally it's a tragedy. So I would say, please vote against this Amendment."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege to salute the Parliamentarian on his continued creativity in the interpretation of the germanness rules."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Pedersen."

Pederson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I concur with Representative Wojcik's comments about township government in Cook county. The ideal situation in an urban area with lots of people and congestion, is to use the local township officials as a sort of a branch office so that they can provide those additional services that would make it much easier for the county. They do a good job, and they have built up the services over the years. You really need local service for the people when you have so many of them. So I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Lang: "My understanding of the law has always been that the voters by referendum in a township can do away with their own township government, is that not the law now?"

Giglio: "Well, I'm not sure, but what I'm trying to do is give the people an opportunity to express themselves with this Amendment, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, my understanding is that the referendum procedure is already in place, but I guess we'll reread this Amendment and see where you're going with it."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Edley."

Edley: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Edley: "In reading the Amendment, and let me just follow up on the line of questioning of the previous speaker, the way I read it, is, you aren't abolishing township government, but simply providing a mechanism to let the people decide if they're getting value from their township government. Is that not..."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Giglio: "That's correct, Representative Edley, and it's only for counties with a million people, which is the County of Cook. It does not pertain to any other county in the State of Illinois."

Edley: "Well, I can't see anything wrong with allowing the people to vote by referendum for the government that they are asked to support with their tax dollars. It sounds like a reasonable Amendment to me."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment and to the previous speaker, if you want to go back home and explain to your township people that you've opened the door for the possible dissolution of township government, without any prior notice to them, without any constructive notice that this was going to happen, you go back to your district and do that. I don't think very many of us want to do that. I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment, and I ask for a Roll Call vote on the question."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Homer: "I think that it's important that we get some clarification as to what the Amendment seeks to do. First of all, your Amendment is limited to Cook County. Is that correct?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Giglio?"

Giglio: "I'm sorry..."

Homer: "I had a couple of clarification questions. Your

Amendment is limited in scope to Cook County."

Giglio: "That's correct."

Homer: "Current law, correct me if I'm wrong, current law allows the voters in any county to abolish township government

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

within their county by referendum. Is that the status of the current law?"

Giglio: "I believe that's correct."

Homer: "But they can't single out individual townships within their county to abolish. The choice is to abolish all township government within a county or to leave it as it is. Is that correct?"

Giglio: "That's correct."

Homer: "Your Bill would, for Cook County, allow the abolition of one township and allow the other townships to continue."

Giglio: "That's correct."

Homer: "The question that I would have then is what would you do with the tax levies for, like, the road fund in the township that was abolished? As I understand your Bill, the county would then be required to provide the local government services that the township previously provided, but how would you handle the road fund of the township? Would it then be an obligation and burden on all the residents of the county?"

Giglio: "No, that's not correct, and you have to understand
Representative Homer, that right now there's a very minimal
amount of roads in the township, and all the moneys then if
this would happen would go to the county, whereby the
county maintains most of the roads now anyway, and that's
the purpose of the Bill."

Homer: "Would there still be a levy, a township levy on the voters that lived in that township?"

Giglio: "No, I doubt it, 'cause if they would be taken over by the county, then they would become county roads."

Homer: "But then how could you then impose a county-wide tax, when residents of the other townships would also be paying a township tax? How would that be fair to the residents of the other townships?"

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Giglio: "Well, this would have nothing to do with the other township. This gives each individual township...and in the county of Cook there are, I believe, 30 townships, so if one township decided to abolish their form of government, the other 29 would still be in existence."

Homer: "I know, but the services that had been provided by the abolished township would now be provided by the county which is supported by tax revenues of all the county residents, so that, for example, General Assistance Fund...the county would then take over the General Assistance Fund of that township, and the tax to support that effort would be levied against all of the residents of the county and those who lived in townships outside of the one abolished would be not only paying for that, but also be paying a separate township levy for general assistance within their township. Would they not?"

Giglio: "Well, I guess you may be correct, however, if all the moneys that were in that particular township, say like there is in mine, the county would probably be well ahead and probably accumulate more money it would take than giving it out, because the township building, the highway building, all the equipment, all the moneys and all the books that says what they own would be turned over to the county, and I would guess that the minimum amount of roads and the services that the county would have to perform, they'd be well ahead as far as having enough money."

Homer: "Was this, the substance of your Amendment, was it in the form of a Bill?"

Giglio: "No."

Homer: "Okay. Well, I think the questions have been asked, I think there's some question, though, about whether this would be fair or workable to all of the residents of the county who, as I see it, would be called upon to pay for

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

the dissolved township's functions as well as pay their own township levies for those same services that are provided by their respective townships, and while the idea, I think, maybe has some merit, I'm not sure that it's been thoroughly thought through in terms of the tax consequences, and so I'm going to have to reluctantly vote 'present' in spite of my high regard for the Sponsor and his intent."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative DeJaegher."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies of the General Assembly, by and large very, very many of us were elected to our first elected positions as township officials. With all due respect to Representative Frank Giglio, that maybe perhaps he's forgotten his history lesson, and that particular lesson was, when the Constitution was established, for the people and by the people, townships became an important part of federal and national government. Ι think that we have been very successful in township government implementing service and etcetera for the people of the State of Illinois. I think what he is doing, even though this legislation pertains only to Cook this would have an adverse effect on other townships throughout the State of Illinois, and all of that are basically involved with township government or receptive to township government, hopefully that you will vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I think we really need to clarify something as it relates to House Bill 760, and that is the fact that this Bill applies only, only to suburban Cook County. I can relate to all of you, issues where, for instance, a number of years ago, downstate we abolished towmship school treasurers, were

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

forced to keep them in Cook County, where we don't need them. We are trying to do something for our taxpayers here in Cook County by giving them the option of determining whether or not they wish to retain township government. Keep in mind, that in township government in Cook County. the assessors don't assess, the collectors don't collect, the road commissioners hardly have any roads to commission and supervisors sometimes don't even supervise, so there's legitimacy in bringing this question before voters in those townships. Let me also address one thing, too, that disturbs me, about some comments that I've heard from the other side of the aisle, and that is the comment of things that we may hear when we go back and listen our township officials. What are your townships going to say? Well, I think, from our side of the aisle, we be saying 'What are the taxpayers going to say?' taxpayers in the township wish to vote and choose to abolish the township government in that particular area, who are we to say that they can't? We all talk about saving money, we all talk about property taxes, we all talk about all those issues that hit home to the property taxpayers' pockets anywhere in the state, and we in suburban Cook County are trying to do something about that, and I can't believe what I'm hearing in terms of the people saying that we should not allow our citizens to have that choice. I firmly believe we should vote 'yes' on this Amendment and adopt it."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves for adoption of Amendment #1 on House Bill 760. There is a request for a recorded Roll Call. All in favor of the Gentleman's Motion...Representative Giglio to close."

Giglio: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think that you've heard some good dialogue here, and I'm not trying to abolish

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

township government. I'm giving the people an opportunity who live in the township, who pay their taxes, who see duplication of government services today, and who want to see their tax dollars go to schools, to the library board, and to other places. People who live in the neighborhood where I live and who has a house like I have, their tax bill just on township government is over \$50. The library board's only \$25. The assessor doesn't assess any more in the township, the collector doesn't collect any more in the township, the road commissioner only has two or three miles of roads. Everybody has a great job, and the tax keeps going higher and higher for a governmental agency that the county does by the mini-centers that we have That's what the mini-centers are for, is to suburbia. bring the county government to the people in the suburban area. Township government was great 100 years ago when you couldn't get to the county seat. It's still great in the rural areas where you can't get to the county seat, but suburbia Cook in the county outside the City of Chicago, it's a disaster and it's a waste of taxpayers' We're talking about more money for schools. Here's an opportunity that takes that tax dollar and give it to the people who need the money, who need the money for school. I would ask for a favorable vote on this Amendment, Madam Speaker, Members of the House."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 on House Bill 760. All members in favor of the Amendment will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there are 30 voting 'yes', 70 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present', and the Amendment fails. Any Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. Can we go back to House
 Bill 1584, Representative Young? Mr. Clerk, read the
 Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1584, a Bill for an Act to amend the Township Law. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill's been read a second time previously.

 Amendment #1 was adopted. The Bill was held for a fiscal note and the Fiscal Note is now filed."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. Continuing where we left off earlier on State and Local Government, Second Reading, we are now ready for House Bill 1947, Representative Keane. Out of the record. House Bill 2039, Representative Bugielski. Is the Gentleman here? Out of the record. House Bill 2040, Representative Bugielski. Out of the record. Representative Parke, for what reason do you rise?"
- Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have an inquiry of Chair. Seems like we have a call of business in front of us that shows State and Local Government on Second Reading. We have 20 Bills listed, not one of those Bills are Republican Bills. I also would like to point out on State and Local on Third Reading there are 30 Bills to be called, there are only 2 Republican Bills on here. On Labor and Commerce there on Second Reading there is only 3 out of 18. On Second Reading, there on Human Services, there are only 3 out of 27, and on Human Services, Third Reading, there is only 14...there are 14, no Republican Bills. Are there not Republican Bills that go on these calls of business? Ιt seems like this is an abuse of the system to have so few Republican Bills that the Speaker is willing to have Now I think there's a point of fairness on behalf of Republican Sponsors who are duly elected by the citizens

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

of this state to have their Bills called, and I think it's an abuse of the Chair that so few Republican Bills are listed to be called at all, and I would hope that the press would so note that."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Parke, a few days ago you had a gold sheet circulated to you where Republican Members we're directed to contact Pam McDonough with your requests for Bills for the Special Orders of Business. Ιf Republicans have Bills that sit in these Special Orders, I would suggest that they follow those instructions. Returning to the Special Order of State and Local Government, Representative Steczo on House Bill 2045. Representative Parke, you have a further issue?"

Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, yes, I, in fact do. I might also, respectfully, point out there are so few Bills on this call that happen to belong to Republicans that perhaps in the committee process so many Republican Bills were killed, never had the opportunity to be heard, and I think that the people of this state ought to know that the process has been slanted tremendously toward Democratic Bills, and the Republican Bills had a very difficult time getting out of the committee, and I would like the press and the people of this state to recognize that fact also."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, as long as the press is being...ought to take note that there're so few Republican Bills, will they also take note that there's so few Republicans?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, I think there was some eavesdropping done on the Republican side of one of their caucuses, and it was their plan not to have many Bills successfully get out of committee, so they could present this argument today, so

43rd Legislative Day

- May 2, 1991
- that they can go to court later on and make a case out of it."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "House Bill 2045, Representative Steczo.

 Out of the record. House Bill 2186, Representative

 Trotter. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Out of the
 record. House Bill 2197, Representative Brunsvold. Do you
 wish the Bill to be read on Second Reading? Representative
 Brunsvold?"
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would you please read this
 Bill a second time and hold it on Second?"
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Thank you. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2197, a Bill for an Act to amend the Fire Equipment Distributors Act."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Excuse...me, Mr. Clerk. What did you say? Hold the Bill on Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Currie, for what reason do you arise?"
- Currie: "I'd like to make...for purposes of making a Motion with respect to House Bill 1085. That Bill was removed from the Consent Calendar by Representative Lang, and my understanding is that he's prepared to remove his objection to the appearance of that Bill on the Consent Calendar, and I've checked with the Republican spokesman on the committee from which that Bill was originally reported. That they have no objection either, so I ask consent to return House Bill 1085 to the Consent Calendar."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. That is correct. I withdraw my objection to the Consent Calendar and ask that it be restored."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "You have heard the Lady's request, and...seeing no objection, the Lady's Bill will be restored to the Consent Calendar by use of the Attendance Roll Call. We will go now to the Special Order of Labor on Second Reading, for the advance notice to Members we will be calling Bills by the following Sponsors: Mautino, Trotter, Currie, and Hasara. The Special Order of Labor, Second Reading, on House Bill 824, Representative Mautino, out of the record. On House Bill 2017, Representative Trotter, out of the record. On House Bill 2074, Representative Currie, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2074, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 2177. Representative Hasara. Out of the record. Special Order Second Reading on House Bill 274, on Human Services. Representative White. Out of the record. House Bill...excuse me, Representative White, do you wish to call House Bill 274? Representative White. Out of the record. House Bill 329, Representative McAfee. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 329, a Bill for an Act to create the Child Care Program. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. Representative Black, for what reason do you arise?"
- Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. We had requested a fiscal note on this Bill. Has it been filed?"
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Mr. Clerk, the Calendar indicates...Yes, the fiscal note has been filed."
- Black: "Thank you."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "House Bill 715, Representative Stern. Do

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

you wish to have the Bill called on Second Reading? Yes, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 715, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the Inspector General. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. Representative White on House Bill 739. Do you wish to have the Bill called on Second Reading? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 739, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Bill will be held on Second Reading...oh, excuse me. Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative White."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative White."

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 is a simple one. It provides information concerning assistance that would be available for child care. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #2, say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes', have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Further Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Bill will be held on Second Reading for fiscal note. House Bill 761, Representative

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Schakowsky. Representative Schakowsky? Do you wish to have the Bill read a second time? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 761, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on Aging. Second Reading of the Bill.

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Amendments?

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Schakowsky."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 is really a technical Amendment, that makes sure that this Bill keeps us in compliance with federal law so that we do not jeopardize any of our Medicaid matching funds. It doesn't change the intent of the Bill in any way...it was drafted with the help of the Department of Public Aid, the Department on Aging, who, with this Amendment, now can...support the legislation. I urge your support of Amendment 1."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 on House Bill 761. All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes have it, and Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. Speaker House Bill 954. Representative Daniels. Out of the record. House Bill 1160, Representative Richmond. Out of the record. Bill 1408, Representative Bugielski. Do you wish to have the Bill called on Second Reading? House Bill 1408. Out of the record. House Bill 1565, Representative Hicks. the Gentleman in the Chamber? Out of the record. Bill 1644, Representative Shirley Jones. Do you wish to have the Bill read a second time? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1644, a Bill for an Act concerning the renovation of homes. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Jones, there has been a request for a fiscal note, so the Bill will be held on Second Reading. Representative Burzynski, House Bill 1908. Representative Burzynski. Out of the record. House Bill 1930, Representative Younge. Wyvetter Younge. Out of the record. House Bill 1940, Representative Representative Stern, do you wish to have the Bill called Out of the record. Representative on Second Reading? Younge, do you want us to return to 1930? Mr. Clerk, can we go back to House Bill 1930 for Representative Younge?"
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1930, a Bill for an Act relating to family resource development. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed, and no Floor Amendments, and the fiscal note to House Bill 1930 as amended has been filed."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. Bill House Representative Hicks. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 2050, Representative Steczo. Out of the record. House Bill 2123, Representative McGuire. Do you wish to have the Bill called on Second Reading? of Out the record. House Bill Representative McGann. Representative McGann. Out of the record. House Bill 2227, Representative White. Representative White? Do you wish to have the Bill read a second time? It's 2227. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2227, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative White."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative White."
- White: "Madam Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 Amendment #2 to House Bill 2227 is a technical Amendment.

 It's one that was asked for by the Illinois Public Aid
 Department, and I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative White moves for the adoption of House Amendment #1...excuse me on House Amendment #2 on House Bill 2227. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Mautino."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Mautino on Amendment #3."

 Mautino: "Thank you very much. This is the Amendment that the

 Sponsor has agreed to adopt which was House Bill 2706 in

 his committee. Basically this says that the provider of

 the health care services can use their receivables as

 security interest in the funding mechanism. That's all it

 does and I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative White."
- White: "As the previous speaker spoke, I'm in full agreement with it, and I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves for adoption of Amendment #3 on House Bill 2227. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 2232, Representative Trotter. Out of the record. House Bill

43rd Legislative Day

- May 2, 1991
- 2292, Representative White. Representative White?"
- White: "Madam Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...I

 move for passage of, the adoption...well."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Do you wish to have the Bill read a second time? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- White: "No Amendments to the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2292, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

 There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 2293,
 Representative White. Do you wish to have the Bill read a
 second time? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2293, a Bill for an Act to create the Podiatrics Scholarship and Residency Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative White, there is a request for a fiscal note, so the Bill will remain on Second Reading. Representative Pullen, House Bill 2400. Out of the record. Representative Walsh, House Bill 2464. Out of the record. Representative Rotello, House Bill 2466. Do you wish to have the Bill read the second time? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2466, a Bill for an Act concerning a program of all-inclusive care for the elderly. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 2469. Representative Capparelli. Do you wish to have the Bill read a second time? Out of the record. Representative Bill 2471. Laurino. House Out οf the record. Representative Currie, House Bill 2510. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, we are going to go back to House Bill 274, Representative White. Will you read the Bill a second

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

time?"

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 274, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed, and no further Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading, and we are also going back and pick up House Bill 2162. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Representative McGann."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2162, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on Aging. Second Reading of the Bill.

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, is being offered by Representative McGann."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the Assembly.

Amendment #2 to House Bill 2162 corrects a...an error in the description of the nutrition provider funded by an area agency on aging. This was a initiative of the Department of Aging, and I would ask for adoption of this Amendment #2."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion, and seeing no opposition, all those in favor of the Amendment will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading...Now go to the Special Order of Constitutional Officers. Second Reading. The following Sponsors are high on that list. Representative

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Novak, Preston, Matijevich, Curran. House Bill 2, Representative Novak. Out of the record. House Bill 915, Representative Preston. Out of the record. House Bill 967, Representative Matijevich. Out of the record. House Bill 1309, Representative Curran. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1309, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Property Control Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Amendments filed?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, is being offered by Representative Curran and Deuchler."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 simply creates the...it guts House Bill 1309 and puts the agreed Bills that were in committee onto this Bill, and if I may, I would like to, because I committed to reading this into the record for the Minority, I would like to read which Bills are going to be put into it and a brief explanation of what those Bills do. This includes the subject matter of House Bill 510, Representative Hartke, his descriptive video service. It includes the subject matter of House Bill 1115, Representative Dunn, equitable restrooms. House Bill 865, Walsh, requires ethanol use in state vehicles. House Bill 363, Representative Weller, drug free schools. I've got a..."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Black, did you have an inquiry? Representative Black, did you have an inquiry?"

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. It would appear that the Amendment is somewhat all-inclusive, and I would rise to the point that I don't think it's been printed and distributed. We don't have a copy, certainly."

Curran: "Let's take this out of the record and give the other

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

side a half hour to look at it. The Amendment does exist, but we'd like to give them a chance to look at it."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Out of the record. House Bill 1515,

Representative Curran. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1515, a Bill for an Act creating the Financial Consumers Association. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, and 3 were adoption in Committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4 is being offered by Representative Pullen."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'll have to say a little something about the Bill, I guess, in order for you to understand the Amendment. The Bill creates a group that's something like CUB, but in a different field, and what my Amendment would do is to take out a very small provision of the Bill which can become a irritation for the people in our districts if this goes forward, which allows this quasi-private organization to use state mailings to send out their information to the public the same way that CUB now mailings from the Secretary of State's office to enclose their membership solicitations and other types of This has been a tremendous irritation to many of my constituents who have talked with me about their feeling that state employees shouldn't be used to stick things into state envelopes for what are essentially quasi-private organizations, organizations that are not state agencies that have nothing to do with the official business for...which they are receiving mail from the Secretary of

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

State. In creating this new organization, this Bill has a small provision in it that allows this organization to do the same thing with state mailings, and my Amendment simply would take out that provision, and I hope the Gentleman will accept it, and the House will adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Curran."

- Curran: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Amendment, though well-intended, simply undermines the opportunity for this Bill to be effective. It is not a...poorly intended Bill...Amendment, but it is in...effect a hostile Amendment, and I'd be hopeful that Members would allow me to have my legislation on Third Reading the way I'd like to have it, and vote it up or down on that basis."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Lady moves for adoption of Amendment #1...Amendment #4 to House Bill 1515. All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. The 'nos' have it, and the Amendment fails. Representative Preston...oh, excuse me, Representative Preston. Are there further Amendments on House Bill 1515?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "There is, however, a request for a fiscal note, Representative Curran, so the Bill will be held on Second Reading. Representative Pedersen?"
- Pedersen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. When you had that voice
 Roll Call I already had my light lit, and I wanted to speak
 to the Amendment, and you ignored it."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "I'm sorry, Representative, I did not see
 your light. Representative Pullen."
- Pullen: "Madam Speaker, I would like to call to your attention that you did not permit me to close the debate on my Amendment, and I do believe that particularly at this stage in the Session, and really throughout the Session, we ought to be able to have the courtesy of allowing Sponsors to

43rd Legislative Day

- May 2, 1991
- close debate as is in the rules, and of allowing Members to fully debate issues even if they might be uncomfortable to some people."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "I'm sorry, Representative. I did not see your light. I did not see anyone else's light seeking recognition before we called for the vote. I believe we are now ready for House Bill 1564, Representative Preston.

 Do you wish to have the Bill read a second time? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1564, a Bill for an Act to amend an act in relationship to charity. Second Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk, no Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 1592, Representative Williams."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1592, a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Deposit Account Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

 There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Out of the record. Representative Keane,
 House Bill 1948. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1948, a Bill for an Act to amend the Cemetery Care Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 2110,
 Representative McAfee. Out of the record. House Bill
 2112, Representative Saltsman. Out of the record. House
 Bill 2118, Representative Jones. Do you wish to have the
 Bill called on Second Reading? Oh, excuse me, it is Lou
 Jones. Representative Lou Jones. Out of the record.
 House Bill 2422, Representative Keane. Mr. Clerk, read the

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2422, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Finance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Keane, there is a request for a fiscal note, and the Bill will be held on Second Reading. House Bill 2523, Representative Williams. Out of the record. House Bill 2531, Representative Steczo. Do you wish to have the Bill called on Second Reading? Out of the record. Special Order of Agriculture and Environment, Second Reading. The Sponsors for the beginning Bills on this list are Representatives Novak, Hoffman, Hartke, Richmond. If those and other Sponsors will be ready, we will try to move your Bills. On House Bill 114, Representative Novak. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 5 of the Callendar, House Bill 114, a Bill for an Act to create the Local Hazardous Waste Collection Program. Second Reading of the Bill. There were no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Novak."
- Novak: "Madam Speaker, I believe a fiscal note's been requested.

 Has the fiscal note arrived?
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Mr. Clerk, have we received a fiscal
 note?"
- Clerk Leone: "There is no fiscal note filed for this Bill."
- Novak: "Okay, just take it out of the record."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Did you want to handle your Amendment first?"
- Novak: "Certainly. Certainly."
- Novak: "Okay, Amendment #1 to House Bill 14 (sic) 114, restricts the use of local hazardous waste collection centers to

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

homeowners that generate small quantities of hazardous waste. In addition the Amendment deletes the requirement in Section IV-4 that a pilot project plan include an assessment of the suitability of the designated area for a regional storage facility site and a recommendation of the site for the multi-purpose hazardous waste facility."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any opposition to the Gentleman's Motion? Seeing none, all in favor of adoption of Amendment #1 say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is adopted. Bill will be held for fiscal note. Oh, excuse me, there is another Amendment. Amendment #2, Mr...."

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
Novak."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "I'm not on. I'm on. Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 deletes the requirement, as I indicated for...that a pilot project plan include an assessment of the suitability of the designated areas of regional storage facility sites, recommendation of the site for a multi-purpose facility. addition to the requirement, the assessments, recommendation be submitted to the Governor, President of the Senate and Speaker of the House no later than March of '92. Section IV-4 is replaced with the requirement that the Environmental Protection Agency shall develop and distribute public information to recommend non-toxic and biodegradable alternatives to hazardous chemicals."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Wennlund"

Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. It appears that Amendment #2 may be out of order because of the adoption of Amendment #1, which deleted the same lines, so it appears that that Amendment...is out of order at this point in time. There's

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

nothing there to delete because Amendment #1 already deleted lines 12 through 18 on page 2 of the Bill. You can't delete what's not there anymore. Once Amendment #1 was adopted, lines 12 through 18 disappeared, and Amendment #2 tries to delete something that isn't there."

- Novak: "Okay. Madam Speaker, could we take this out of the record, please, so we can get it cleared up?"
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Mr. Clerk, take the Bill out οf the record. The Bill will be held on Second Reading, with the First Amendment having been adopted, and we'll go resolve the issue. House Bill 204. Representative Jay Hoffman. Representative Hoffman? Out of the record. House Bill 314, Representative Hartke. Out House Bill 345, Representative Richmond. of the record. Out of the record. House Bill 580. Representative Do you wish to have the Bill called on Second Reading? Out οf the record. House Bill 706, Representative Steczo. Do you wish to have the Bill called on Second Reading? Out of the record. House Bill 742, Representative Granberg. Representative Granberg. Do you wish to have the Bill called on Second Reading? Out of the record. House Bill 1135, Mr. Clerk read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1135, a Bill for an Act to amend the Meat and Poultry Inspection Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 1199,
 Representative Granberg. Out of the record. House Bill
 1207, Representative Hartke. Out of the record. House
 Bill 1449, Representative Peterson. Mr. Clerk, read the
 Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 14..."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Out of the record. House Bill 1475,

 Representative Black. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1475, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Solid Waste Management Act. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Amendments filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Black."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 that we talked about in committee simply inserts some language that the, the director of the Department of Central Management Services or designee and the executive director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education or the designee will be added to this task force, and since both of these agencies certainly creates a great deal of material that we might be interested in recycling, I would think it only makes good sense to add this Amendment. I would ask your favorable consideration of Floor Amendment #1."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any opposition to Amendment #1? Seeing none, the Gentleman's Motion is, 'Shall we adopt Amendment #1 to House Bill 1475?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments."
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 1522, Representative Curran. Do you wish to have the Bill called on Second Reading? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1522, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Wat...Ground Water Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment
 #1 is being offered by Representative Curran."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Curran."

- Curran: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 simply puts the Bill into the position that I guaranteed the, both the Majority and Minority side when that Bill became an agreed Bill, and that is that we would change from the University of Illinois which was never the intention of the Bill. It was an inadvertent drafting error, and it should have been Southern Illinois University. In addition to that, what this Bill does is offers a, a repository, a location for federal funds to be deposited to to work alongside state funds in improving our ground water research."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any opposition to the Gentleman's Motion? The...the Gentleman moves to adopt Floor Amendment #1 on House Bill 1522. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

- Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. Speaker House Bill 1588. Representative Kulas. Out of the record. House Bill 1741. Representative Hicks. Representative Hicks. Out of the record. House Bill 1850, Representative Hicks? Out of the record. House Bill 2019, Representative Peterson. Representative Peterson requests the Bill be read a second time."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2019, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

 There are no...There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 2020 Representative Balthis. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2020, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Solid Waste Management Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Balthis."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Balthis."
- Balthis: "Madame Speaker, this is a, an Amendment making a, merely a technical, clerical change in the Bill, nothing affecting the substance of the Bill, and it was suggested by CMS. I move the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion.

 Seeing no opposition, the question is, 'Shall Floor

 Amendment #1 be adopted on House Bill 2020?' All in favor

 say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the

 Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. Speaker House Bill 2022. Representative Hensel. Out of the record. House Bill 2250, Representative Kulas. Out of the record. House Bill 2253, Representative Kulas. Out of the record. House Bill 2254, out of the record. House Bill 2325, Representative Weller. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Out of House Bill 2338, Representative Hannig. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2338, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Purchasing Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

 There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 2451,
 Representative Morrow. Do you wish to have the Bill read a
 second time? Out of the record. House Bill 2473,
 Representative Kulas, wishes to have the Bill read a second
 time, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2473, a Bill for an Act to amend the Pollution Abatement Enforcement Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Amendments filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "There...there are no Committee or Floor
 Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. Oh, excuse me, there is a request for a fiscal note, Representative Kulas. So the Bill will be held on Second Reading. We will proceed to the Special Order of Banking. The Sponsors with Bills on that order are Representatives Currie, Capparelli, Preston, and McGann. House Bill 67, Representative Currie. Out of the record. House Bill 1488, Representative Capparelli. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. No, out of the record, excuse me. House Bill 1911, Representative Capparelli. We took...we took 1488 out of the record. You have the next one as well, 1911. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1911, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Amendments filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no Floor or Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. Representative Preston,

 House Bill 1912. Do you wish to have the Bill read a
 second time? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1912, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Floor or Committee Amendments. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 2595, Representative McGann. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2595, a Bill for an Act to amend the Check Cashing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative McGann."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the Assembly.

Amendment #1 to House Bill 2595 is a initiative of IRMA but it deletes from the Bill the prohibition against requiring the use of a credit card as a condition of accepting a check whether as a means of identification or other purposes. It also allows the use of a credit card number if a check is issued in payment of the credit card account which is designated by that credit card number. This was their initiative, and I would ask for adopting this Amendment #1 to House Bill 2595."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "No one seeking recognition, the Gentleman's Motion is for the adoption of Amendment #1.

Excuse me, Representative Black."

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Perhaps we need a little order in the Chamber. I think I know what the Gentleman's Amendment does but let me make sure. It, it does not require, does it Representative a, that you put a credit card number on a check? In fact, it does just the opposite. Doesn't it say you can't force me to put my credit card number on a check for identification?"

McGann: "That is, that is correct."

Black: "And this is the Amendment that you worked out with the retail merchants and other parties?"

McGann: "That is correct."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted on House Bill 2595?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. We'll now go to Special Order, Consumer Protection, Second Reading. The Sponsors

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

are Schakowsky, Farley, Granberg, DeLeo, and Giglio. House Bill 208, Representative Schakowsky. Out of the record. House Bill 1858, Representative Farley. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 2026, Representative Granberg. Representative Granberg in the Chamber? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2026, a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act.

Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Floor...Mr. Clerk, I thought Amendment #1
 had been adopted in Committee."

Clerk Leone: "Correction, that's Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representatives Matijevich and Granberg."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Matijevich on Amendment
#2. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, it hasn't been printed, but I...I
would alert the Body that it's a very simple Amendment.
All of you've seen in the mail, you probably received them,
these phoney checks which aren't checks at all, and all the
Amendment does is say that on such checks they'd have to
have printed in large diagonal letters across it, 'This is
not a check.' I don't think anybody would be opposed to
that, so I would move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, thank you Madam Speaker. Since the Amendment has not been printed and distributed, and we have not seen a copy of it, we'd like to, if you could take the Bill out of the record until we could at least see a copy

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

of it. We'd appreciate that."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 2030, Representative DeLeo. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 2576, Representative Giglio. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2576, a Bill for an Act relating to restaurant food disclosure. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. There is a request, Representative, for a fiscal note, so the Bill will be held on Second Reading awaiting a fiscal note. We will now go to the Special Order of Economic Development, Second Reading. The Sponsors early on that list are Representatives McNamara, Wyvetter Younge, John Dunn, Tenhouse. Homer. Morrow, etc. House Bill 812. Representative McNamara. Representative McNamara, do you wish to have the Bill read a second time? Mr. Clerk, the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 812, a Bill for an Act to ensure equity in restroom facilities. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative McNamara."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. What, what Floor Amendment
#1 does is actually dilutes the Bill somewhat. It is
patterned after the successful implementation of washrooms
at the White Sox Comiskey Park. It is taken with their

43rd Legislative Day

- May 2, 1991
- discussion in mind, and I urge its approval."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Just a point of inquiry of the Chair. We do not have Floor Amendment #1."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Mr. Clerk, has the Amendment been printed and distributed? Representative McNamara, the Amendment has not been printed and distributed. We'll take the Bill out of the record."
- McNamara: "That's what I've just been informed. I'll pull it out of the record."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Thank you. Representative McNamara, there has also been a request for a fiscal note. If you are not aware of that, you may want to get started on that. House Bill 879, Representative Younge, Wyvetter Younge.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 879, a Bill for an Act to amend the Build Illinois Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Younge."
- Younge: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 would authorize the fourth year funding for an incubator in a financially depressed city. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speake Satterthwaite: "You've heard the Lady's Motion.

 Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would simply again rise for a point of inquiry. Our staff indicates that the Lady's Amendment may actually only apply to the Village of Robbins which is not going to help the Sponsor with what she's trying to do. I would suggest that the Sponsor take

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

the Bill out of the record and have the staff people go over this Amendment because we feel that it, it is specifically drawn for the Village of Robbins, and I don't think that's her intent."

Younge: "Take the Bill out, please."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Take the Bill out of the record. House
 Bill 882, Representative Wyvetter Younge. Mr. Clerk, read
 the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 882, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to East St. Louis. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Younge."
- Younge: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 would change the, this Bill will establish the Enterprise Zone Demonstration Cooperation, and the intent of Floor Amendment #1 is to change the supervising agency from the Illinois Financial Advisory Authority to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs and the East St. Louis Area Development Authority."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Younge."
- Younge: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The intent of Floor Amendment #2 is to change the funding source from a earnings tax to funds developed under, under the Tax Increment Finance District, and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Black."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Again, perhaps the speaker may want to get some order in the Chambers and find out why these Amendments are not being distributed. We don't have Floor Amendment #2, and about more than half of the cases this morning or this afternoon, we haven't had these Amendments, and I think maybe we ought to make sure that we're all in sync here."

Younge: "Take the Bill out of the record."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Will the Clerk check about distribution of this Amendment? Out of the record, please. House Bill 1021, Representative Dunn. Out of the record. House Bill 1134, Representative Tenhouse. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1132. Correction, that's House Bill
 1134, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Enterprise
 Zone Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no
 Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 1571,
 Representative Younge. Out of the record. House Bill
 1580, Representative Younge, Wyvetter Younge. Mr. Clerk,
 read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1580, a Bill for an Act in relationship to employment opportunities. Second Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Amendments filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 1624,
 Representative Homer. Out of the record. House Bill 1876,
 Representative Morrow. Representative Morrow, do you wish
 to have the Bill called on Second Reading? Out of the
 record. House Bill 1935, Representative Giorgi. Mr...out
 of the record? Out of the record. House Bill 2005,
 Representative Edley. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2005, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 2507,
 Representative McPike. Out of the record. The Special
 Order, Education/Finance, Second Reading. The Sponsors are
 Lang, Satterthwaite, Giglio, and McNamara. Representative
 Lang requests that we not read House Bill 19. Mr. Clerk, I
 believe House Bill 827 has already been read a second time.
 Is that accurate?"
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 827, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, has been read a second time."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Amendments filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments. A fiscal note has been filed on this Bill."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 899, Representative Giglio. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 899, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to school officials. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed and no further Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 1097,

 Representative McNamara. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1097, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. We'll now go to the Special Order of Housing, Second Reading. The Sponsors for those Bills are Wyvetter Younge, Turner, Mautino, and Davis. If those Sponsors can be ready, we will call House Bill 1038, Representative Wyvetter Younge."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1038, a Bill for an Act to establish the Illinois Low-Income Home Buyers Program. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. Representative Turner,
House Bill 1243. Out of the record. House Bill 1323,
Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1323, a Bill for an Act to amend the Housing Authorities Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed and no further Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. House Bill 2003. Representative Davis. Representative Monique Davis, wish to have the Bill called on Second Reading? Out of the Ιs Representative Turner, House Bill Representative Turner in the chamber? Out of the record. go back and take the Bills on Special Orders We will now on, on Third Readings. We will go to the Special Order Labor. Third Reading. The Members having Bills on this Order are Representatives Curran, Rotello, Giglio, Turner, Ryder, Ronan, Kirkland, McGuire, and DeJaegher. If Members who have Bills on the Special Order of Labor, Third Reading, will take note, we will try to call as many of those Bills as possible on Third Reading, starting with House Bill 589, Representative Curran. Out of the record. House Bill 595, Representative Rotello. Out of the record. House Bill 703, Representative Giglio. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 703, a Bill for an Act in relationship to payment by contractors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What House Bill 703 does is creates the Contractors Prompt Payment Act and requires the contractors to pay the subcontractors the amount allowed the contractor on account of the work that he performed in not less than ten days or

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

after receipt of each progressive payment, and there's some penalties imposed on it, also. What we're trying to do is clean up some of the language to where, where the general contractor holds back the subcontractor's money. I know of no opposition to the Bill, and I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "You have heard the Gentleman's Motion.

Is there any discussion? Seeing no one seeking recognition the question is, 'Shall House Bill 703 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue there are 79 voting 'aye', 34 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and House Bill 703 is declared passed. House Bill 741, Representative Curran. Out of the record. House Bill 774, Representative Turner. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Art, Representative Turner. Out of the record. House Bill 962, Representative Ryder. Out of the record. House Bill 1533, Representative Ronan. Representative Ronan, do you wish to call this Bill? House Bill 152...1533. Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you Madam Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1533 creates the Right to Privacy in the Work Place Act. It deals with individuals who have problems with their employees for engaging in lawful activities outside the work place. We amended the Bill to..."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Excuse me, Representative. I believe the Clerk needs to read the Bill a third time."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1533, a Bill for an Act in relationship to employment. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Now, Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you Madam Speaker and Members of the House. House
Bill 1533 creates the Right to Privacy in the Work Place
Act. I amended the Bill to establish the concept, this

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

would deal with individual employees who engage in lawful activities outside of the work place and use lawful products, is really the intent of this legislation. I'll be glad to answer any questions concerning House Bill 1533."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Pullen."
- Pullen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to ask the Sponsor a couple of questions, please."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield? The Sponsor says he'll yield."
- Pullen: "Does this Bill, does this Bill deal with activities or products on premises, on the work premises?"
- Ronan: "No, no. We, we had a situation where an individual was disciplined by a company for using a lawful product outside of the work environment."
- Pullen: "Could you please tell me then what the title has to do with the Bill?"
- Ronan: "It's the title that the Reference Bureau gave me. What can I tell ya? Representative, I didn't create the title.

 It's like writing a newspaper story. Did you ever see a headline that doesn't make any sense to the story? Well, we have the same power in the Reference Bureau."
- Pullen: "Would this Bill prohibit an organization like the American Heart Association or the American Lung Association from refusing to employ a person who smokes?"
- Ronan: "Who...if, if they perform that activity outside the work place, it would."
- Pullen: "Thank you. I'd like to address the Bill, please."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Pullen."
- Pullen: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The title that the Reference Bureau has arranged for the Gentleman's Bill to have on the board is indeed, as the Gentleman has indicated, very misleading. This Bill has

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

nothing to do with privacy in the work place. It, it has to do with prohibiting employers from making standards for their employees based on what they believe to be legitimate concerns. For example, as the Gentleman just indicated, the American Heart Association, the Cancer Society, Lung Association, would be required to hire an individual who is a tobacco smoker. Organizations which work against problems in our society dealing with alcoholism would be required to hire people who drink even to excess. Churches would have to be required to hire people who perhaps commit, I shouldn't say commit, who are occasionally drunk in public, as long as it's something they're doing outside the work place and as long deals with a lawful product or a lawful activity, whatever that might mean. This Bill would cause employers to to make decisions that really none of are this Legislature's business or be hauled before a tribunal of the state and be required to hire people or keep people in their employ who, who do not in their private life meet the standards that employers have every right to demand of In a day and age when a, when a person's use of lawful product might cause their insurance risk to because they smoke and consume alcohol excessively and that kind of thing, you're asking employers to pick a higher and higher health insurance premium in passing this Bill. Well, calling it something that may sound very nice and has nothing to do with what the legislation actually says. I urge a 'no' vote. I'm sure the Gentleman is well-intentioned with this, but in trying to address one particular situation for one particular person he is going to drive employers and their jobs out of this State. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Klemm."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Klemm: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he'll yield."

Klemm: "Representative Ronan, let me, maybe you could walk me through an example. Let's say I am a real estate broker and I have some real estate agents who sell property in the community as they do. Unfortunately say one of them gets, does a quite a bit of heavy drinking on his off hours and creates a quite a disturbance every evening and assaults people and everything else, and this is a person that I hired to sell real estate is really giving my company, my brokership, a pretty bad name, plus everybody else. I would not be able to discharge this employee because they would be using lawful products off of the work place. Would that be correct?"

Ronan: "I, under the wording of this legislation, if he engages and uses a lawful product and his, in a non-work place environment, you're correct, and it doesn't affect his work. Don't forget the goal is. Does it affect his work?"

Klemm: "Well, well, okay, but do you think that a, that the integrity or public image of, of employees do reflect on their work in the work place? I mean..."

Ronan: "If that kind of activity does affect his ability in the work place and the supervisor determines that, then the supervisor can take appropriate activity, can take appropriate action."

Klemm: "So even though the activities of somebody affects the business, they would have no recourse to discharge that employee. Would that be correct?"

Ronan: "(Inaudible.)"

Klemm: "Thank you. To the Bill, Madam Speaker, I really think as I understand the Sponsor, I, his intentions I think are well-meaning but I think in the real world I think

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

employers have to have a degree, some degree, of having responsibleness to the activities of some of their employees that are doing discredit, a disservice, hurting the business, and doing everything else. I think there has to be a, a common ground. I think this Bill probably goes a little bit too far from what the Sponsor really would like it to be, however, I think this would not be an appropriate Bill to pass in its present form."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Ronan to close."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's a pretty simple concept we're trying to establish, and I'm kinda surprised with colleagues on the other side of the aisle have always been the party for really getting government off of backs and let people be able to go home and engage in lawful activities and do the right thing. I'm really saddened that we've got Members of the General Assembly who believe that we should have a spy system set up, where people should be able to be terrorized when they're home, trying to do something that's lawful, using lawful products. It's a sad day in the General Assembly when the party of free enterprise tries to use those arguments. It's a good piece of legislation. It makes a lot of sense. It's fair for the people of this state. I move for the passage of House Bill 1533."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1533 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 61 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no', and I don't see a light. Okay, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I'd like to verify the Roll Call, please."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "There's a re, request for verification.

Mr. Clerk, read the Absentees."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting. Representative Levin is not voting."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Poll the Affirmative."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Balanoff. Bugielski. Burke. Capparelli. Curran. Currie. Davis. Deering. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Farley. Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi. Hicks. Jay Hoffman. Homer. Lou Jones. Granberg. Shirley Jones. Keane. Kulas. Lang. Laurino. LeFlore. Martinez. Marinaro. Matijevich. Mautino. McGann. McGuire. McNamara. McPike. Morrow. Mulcahev. Munizzi. Novak. Obrzut. Phelan. Preston. Rice. Ronan. Rotello. Saltsman. Santiago. Schakowsky. Schoenberg. Shaw. Steczo. Stepan. Trotter. Turner. Williams. Wolf. Anthony Young. Wivetter Younge White. and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Are there questions of the affirmative? Pullen: "Representative Balanoff?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Balanoff. Balanoff. Is
the Gentlemanin the chamber? Remove him."you,
Representative Trotter. Representative Trotter. Is the
Gentleman in the chamber? Representative

Pullen: "Thank you, Representative Trotter?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Trotter. Representative Trotter. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Remove him."

Pullen: "Thank you. Representative Rotello?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Rotello. Representative Rotello is in the rear of the chamber."

Pullen: "Thank you. Representative..."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "May Representative Bugielski be verified?"

Pullen: "Yes. Representative DeLeo, please?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative DeLeo. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative DeLeo. Remove him.

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Representative Richmond is asking for verification."

Pullen: "Yes."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Excuse me, he's asking to change his vote from 'no' to 'aye', from 'present' to 'aye'."

Pullen: "Representative Obrzut."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Obrzut. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Obrzut. Remove him and return Representative DeLeo as voting 'aye'."

Pullen: "Representative Steczo."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Steczo. Representative Steczo. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Remove him. Representative Mulcahey, for what reason do you seek recognition? You wish to be verified?"

Pullen: "Go ahead."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Pullen, may Representative Mulcahey be verified?"

Pullen: "Yes. Representative Schoenberg?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Schoenberg is in his seat."

Pullen: "Representative S..."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Steczo has returned to the chamber. Return him as voting 'aye'."

Pullen: "Representative Shaw?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Shaw. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? Representative Shaw. Remove him."

Pullen: "Representative Hartke?"

Representative Hartke. Representative Hartke is voting 'no'."

Pullen: "Oh, that's great. I'm sorry. Representative Keane?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Keane. He's here at the front of the chamber."

Pullen: "Representative Hicks."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hicks is in his Chair.

Representative Obrzut has returned to the chamber.

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Returning to the Roll Call as voting 'aye'."

Pullen: "Representative Shirley Jones?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Jones is in her Chair."

Pullen: "No further questions."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Stern. Representative Stern wishes to be changed from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Woolard. Nothing further. On this...Representative Hannig wishes to go from 'no' to 'aye'. On this question, there are 61 voting 'aye', voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the Bill shall be declared passed. Having received а Constitutional Majority, this Bill is declared House...okay...Bill. House Bill 1843, Representative Kirkland. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, and Mr. McPike will be in the Chair."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1843, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kirkland."

Kirkland: "It's a real...thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It's a real simple Bill that clarifies that state agencies, as well as now local governments and school districts, can utilize conviction information taped from the Department of State Police in evaluating the qualifications and character of employees or perspective employees."

Speaker McPike: "And on the Bill, Representative Homer."

Homer: "Yes. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Kirkland: "Yes."

Homer: "This Bill went through State Government Committee?"

Kirkland: "Yes. The reason is, what it really does is bring some language over from Chapter 38 into the Human Rights Statute in it's exactly the same language they inadvertently left out state agencies in the Human Rights Statute. But, both

.≒43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

the parts of both statutes say the same thing."

Homer: "This has to do with governmental employees having access to a prospective employee's criminal history?"

Kirkland: "Um, yes."

Homer: "And current law allows units of local government and school districts to have that information and..."

Kirkland: "And under Chapter 38, state agencies also. This Human Rights language references that Chapter 38 and just inadvertently left out the state agency language in referencing back to Chapter 38."

Homer: "So, you want state agency to have access to criminal history checks in determining whether to employ a prospect?"

Kirkland: "That's correct and as I'm saying in Chapter 38, paragraph 206-3b that's actually already authorized for all three forms of government. This language was brought over also into the Human Rights, this section of the Human Rights Statute, but state agencies were inadvertently left out of the Human Rights Section of a..."

Homer: "Who wants...Is this a State Police Bill?"

Kirkland: "No. I think agency Bill from Human Rights."

Homer: "It's an Agency Bill from Human Rights? I'm curious, why would they, why would they be interested in this? Why would they, why would the Department on Human Rights want criminal histories to be available to state agencies?"

Kirkland: "Let's see, I guess that's a good question. There is language in Section 2-103 that talks about civil rights.

The first sentence of that Section talks about it being a civil rights violation for any employer or employment agency or labor organization to inquire on written application whether a job applicant has ever been arrested.

And in the second sentence just as there and has been there except it left out state agencies to clarify that that

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

doesn't mean that they can't use conviction records. It strikes me as almost, you know, it almost intended to be a vehicle somewhere down the road, but it does correct a..."

Homer: "Alright, I understand it's just hard for me to contemplate why the Department on Human Rights would be, whose job it is to protect against unfair discrimination, would be offering a Bill that would allow for discrimination. It just seems odd, and I also note the Bill references the Criminal Identification Act, and we can find no such Act on the books."

Kirkland: "You can find no such Act?"

Homer: "Yeh, is there such an Act as a Criminal Identification
Act that is cross referenced in the Bill?"

Kirkland: "It is Chapter 38, paragraph 206-3b, according to my notes."

Homer: "Chapter 38, 206 what?"

Kirkland: "-3a and b, I should say."

Homer: "Can you hold just..."

Kirkland: "Sure."

Homer: "Can you hold just a second?"

Kirkland: "I'm sorry, can I add one thing? This came from the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. I'm sorry, I had my source incorrect."

Homer: "Mr. Speaker, I don't think we should take the Body's time on this, but I would ask the Sponsor to take it from the record until we could clarify some of the..."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, the Sponsor...the Sponsor is willing.

The Bill is out of the record. House Bill 2100.

Representative McGuire. Mr. McGuire. Read the Bill, Mr.

Clerk. 2100."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2100, a Bill for an Act in relationship to work place literacy. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McGuire."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

McGuire: "Yes Sir. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to explain the Bill. The Bill creates a literacy program in the work place. I think it's a good Bill. It's to help encourage education in the employment field for those who need it and I would encourage the passage of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "And on that, Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Co-Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Wennlund: "What employees are covered under the terms of this Bill, Representative McGuire?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. McGuire."

McGuire: "Sir."

Speaker McPike: "Repeat your question."

Wennlund: "What employees are covered or not covered under the terms of this Act?"

McGuire: "Labor employees, union employees."

Wennlund: "But, it does not cover all employees of an employer?"

McGuire: "No sir."

Wennlund: "Why is it limited to only labor employees?"

McGuire: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear the question."

Wennlund: "Is there not a need for all employees to be literate in the work place?"

McGuire: "I would encourage the passage of this legislation and if there is any remedial action taken it could be taken with other legislation. I would like to see the Bill passed. It's my first Bill, and it's a Bill to support labor and I would like to have the consensus of the House."

Wennlund: "How much money is this going to cost, Representative?"

McGuire: "Not very much."

Wennlund: "So, it's not going to cost any money at all?"

McGuire: "Not very much."

Wennlund: "Does the employer pay or does the State pay?"

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

McGuire: "I'm sorry to delay with the answer, counselor, it depends on the appropriation."

Wennlund: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear your answer, Representative."

McGuire: "It doesn't require any appropriation."

Wennlund: "It does not require an appropriation?"

McGuire: "No."

Wennlund: "Does the employer then conduct the literacy programs for the employee?"

McGuire: "Yes, in the work place."

Wennlund: "In the work place during work hours?"

McGuire: "Yes, Sir."

Wennlund: "And now if they do that during their lunch hour or is there certain times of the day?"

McGuire: "That would be up to the work place."

Wennlund: "How many hours does this entail, to conduct the program, Representative?"

McGuire: "It's a voluntary program. We don't have the number of hours worked out. I think that would depend on the need."

Wennlund: "Well, it's voluntary, that means the employer doesn't have to conduct the literacy programs in the work place?

Is that correct then?"

McGuire: "That's correct, counselor."

Wennlund: "So, an employer would not be required to a..."

McGuire: "That's correct."

Wennlund: "Conduct these literacy programs at all."

McGuire: "That's correct."

Wennlund: "Then what's the purpose of the Bill?"

McGuire: "Say it again?"

Wennlund: "What's the purpose of the Bill then if an employer doesn't have to...make sure all employees are literate?"

McGuire: "The purpose of the Bill. The purpose of the Bill is trying to enhance education in the work place."

Wennlund: "Now does this make it so employees can get their GED

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

or something?"

McGuire: "Could what?"

Wennlund: "Does this make it so employees..."

McGuire: "GED. Yes. Sir."

Wennlund: "Is that what it does?"

McGuire: "Yes, Sir."

Wennlund: "How about advanced degrees?"

McGuire: "Yes. Yes."

Wennlund: "It does that, too?"

McGuire: "Whatever education is desired and needed."

Wennlund: "What is the genesis of the Bill, Representative?"

McGuire: "Well, I think my interest in education and employment in my area and in the State of Illinois."

Wennlund: "Is this, are the terms of this Bill alluded only to union employees or can nonunion employees participate in these literacy programs?"

McGuire: "It's everybody. Everybody."

Wennlund: "And does the literacy program only teach them how to
 read or does it teach them how to write and do
 mathematics?"

McGuire: "I'm sorry, Sir, you're speaking too fast and I can't hear you over here."

Wennlund: "Alright, we'll slow it down a little bit. Does the Bill, is it limited to reading and writing or can it include math and science?"

McGuire: "Everything."

Wennlund: "Everything. The Secretary of State's Office, do they do this now?"

McGuire: "Sir. Pardon me, Sir."

Wennlund: "Doesn't the Secretary of State have programs that do this now?"

McGuire: "Not that I'm aware of. Not of this same type. No Not of this same type. Not the rule."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Wennlund: "Have you discussed this with the Secretary of State?"

McGuire: "Say it again."

Wennlund: "Have you discussed this Bill with the Secretary of State to determine whether or not it might duplicate..."

McGuire: "No. Not personally, No, Sir."

Wennlund: "You have not discussed it or it does not duplicate?"

McGuire: "No, Sir."

Wennlund: "Now wait a minute."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund, could you bring this questioning to a close?"

Wennlund: "The final question is. Is this your first Bill,
Representative?"

McGuire: "Yes, Sir."

Wennlund: "Thank you."

McGuire: "It came out of committee with flying colors."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield for a short question?"

McGuire: "Yes."

Klemm: "Representative, when you presented this in committee we had asked why not include all the employees in Illinois and not just a smaller segment? You said, you had no problem with doing that and we said we had no problem supporting it, but we see that you haven't included all the employees of Illinois for your concern for them and I was wondering why didn't you?"

McGuire: "Well, what I really said, Representative Klemm, was I have no problem with it. I think it could be another piece of legislation and it is for any employee as the fine print shows."

Klemm: "But, you're saying that you didn't want all employees to be under your Bill? I had thought you had indicated that you were concerned about all employees."

McGuire: "Yes."

43rd Legislative Day

- May 2, 1991
- Klemm: "And I know you are and I was wondering why you didn't make that change that you indicated you would not be opposed to."
- McGuire: "Well, not to be rude, Representative Klemm. You never came to me on it."
- Klemm: "Well, I thought discussion in the committee was probably as appropriate as could be. We have dealt with this before."
- McGuire: "Well, I'm a freshman. I didn't know that that was appropriate. I'm sorry."
- Klemm: "Would you be agreeable in the Senate to at least allow all employees in Illinois be allowed to partake of this?"
- McGuire: "I would like to get the Bill passed as is, if you don't mind."
- Klemm: "Well, I realize that in the House. I'm talking about is when you get to the Senate would you be opposed to having the Senate amend or add it to the Sponsor..."
- McGuire: "I'm always open to consideration. We'll consider that at the time."
- Klemm: "But, you don't want it on this Bill, very honestly? Is
 that right?"
- McGuire: "I'd like the Bill passed as is, and will consider that when it gets to the Senate."
- Klemm: "Alright, so then you really don't want all of Illinois employees to be covered?"
- McGuire: "Yes, I do. Yes, I do"
- Klemm: "But, not on your Bill. Okay. I just want to be sure what. You're saying one thing and then you say something else. I just want to be clear that I didn't take the time to change it. Thank you very much. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I think he took a lot of heat already, but I was just going to ask one question. Jack, how does

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

this affect the Constitutional Rights of the illiterate?" McGuire: "Constitutional Rights of who?"

Matijevich: "You know. Zeke Giorgi has often said he doesn't just represent the literate, he represents the illiterate, the gamblers, the Constitutional Rights of everyone. Did you get that, Jack? How does this affect the Constitutional Rights of the illiterate?"

McGuire: "I'd say it enhances the Constitutional Rights, John, of the illiterate or literate."

Matijevich: "You know, all through this you've been prompted by Zeke Giorgi, does this affect the Legislature at all?"

McGuire: "Anyone, who needs educational enhancement, I would say that, it includes."

Matijevich: "The reason that I say that."

McGuire: "I don't think there is anyone in this room that needs it."

Matijevich: "The reason I asked that earlier question is that if anybody was listening earlier today, Zeke Giorgi, in response to another Gentleman, said, and I know he wanted to say, 'I was watching your antics in the Appropriation Committee, but he said 'I was watching your antiques in the Appropriations Committee, so I think the House ought to be under...the...this this Bill as much as anybody else and especially my seat mate."

McGuire: "Thank you very much, John."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Myron Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

McGuire: "Yes."

Olson: "Representative Matijevich has raised a serious issue,

Representative McGuire and that is the illiteracy that is

quite often apparent on this House floor. Do I understand

you to say that your Bill will take care of those of us who

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

have problems expressing ourselves well?"

McGuire: "I would think so. Yes. If you avail yourself of the service, it may help."

Olson: "And Representative Giorgi is the leader of the pack, is that what you are suggesting to us?"

McGuire: "No, I don't..."

Olson: "I see Giorgi giving you an out signal there. Well, we'll have to look at this Bill very carefully because we're getting conflicting views from two of our leaders there."

McGuire: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It appears to me that the language of the Bill only opportunities for literacy programs in the work place and while it does define certain groups as eligible to receive grants, there is nothing that limits the program for literacy to those specific groups and so my interpretation the Gentleman's legislation is that any employees who needed to increase their literacy skills could be tutored under the grants that might be available under legislation. And I would certainly hope that even though there are literacy grants available through the Secretary of States office that this would not prohibit us having additional programs funded through the Department of Labor. And I certainly suggest that the Gentleman has a very good Bill for his first Bill and urge your support for the measure."

McGuire: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker McPike: "Is there anyone except Representative Satterthwaite that is for this Bill?" Representative McGuire to close."

McGuire: "Yes, Sir. I think the thrust of the Bill is education and I don't believe that cost should enter into it. I

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

believe that the State of Illinois deserves and needs the education facilities and enhancement in the work place as anywhere else. I just believe that there can not be too much emphasis on education. Thank you very much. I move for the passage of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2100 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

Representative McGuire, would you like to explain your vote."

McGuire: "Sir."

Speaker McPike: "Would you like to explain your vote?"

McGuire: "I think you've given the oldest freshman here a little heart attack. I'd appreciate your reconsideration. John, says you're all illiterate."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Mr. Clerk, did you take the record? Mr. Black."

Black: "Well I was going to request a verification but I perhaps will have to verify the negative. I'm not sure."

Speaker McPike: "On this Bill there are 114 'ayes', 1 'no'.

House Bill 2100 having received the Constitutional Majority
is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2104, Representative
DeJaegher. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2104, a Bill for an Act to amend the Prevailing Wage Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. DeJaegher"

DeJaegher: "We've got an Amendment on this."

Speaker McPike: "Representative DeJaeqher."

DeJaegher: "Mr. Speaker. I think there is an Amendment on 2104."

Speaker McPike: "It's on Third Reading. Would you like ...?"

DeJaegher: "Oh, I'm sorry. Would you take, would you please take this Bill back to Second for the purpose of Amendment?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Yes, Mr. McGuire. I'm sorry.

43rd Legislative Day

- May 2, 1991
- Representative DeJaegher. The Gentleman asks leave to return the Bill to Second Reading. Are there any objections, Mr. Black?"
- Black: "The only objection, Mr. Speaker, is that I'm not sure it's been printed...and not distribute it. We don't have it."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. DeJaegher. This Amendment is not printed.

 It is not printed. Out of the record. The Amendment is not printed."
- DeJaegher: "Then just keep it there, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker McPike: "It's on Third Reading. Take it out of the record. On Page 52 of the Calendar, under Order of Concurrances, House Bill Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 to House Bill 277, I was encouraged by Representative Woolard, to accept this concurrence because it pertains to his district, and I would like to have him comment on Amendment #1 to House Bill 277."
- Speaker McPike: "On the Concurrence Motion, Representative Woolard."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of Woolard: the think we in Southern Illinois have recipients of many many good things from the people of this Body. But, this gives us an opportunity this time to maybe come back to the rescue of some other areas in need. What this TIF legislation will do is give us the opportunity to ' possibly even support ourselves and others. The Amendment that was placed on by the Senate to House Bill 277 will provide an opportunity for counties to have TIF districts under the jurisdiction with no cost to the state in areas where there would be a 1,000 job creation or more and areas where there would be 5000 acres involved in the project, in areas where there would be 12% or more unemployment average

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

over the last year. I think that this addresses the kinds of needs that this legislation was intended for in its beginning. We would very much encourage you to support the concurrence of the Senate Amendment to House Bill 277. Hopefully, we can return the favor."

Speaker McPike:Further discussion? "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Many of you have been gracious enough to help us several times in our plea to try to diversify from the economy in Southern Illinois, in the rural areas of Illinois that have been set back due to the coal market, the agricultural market. We have so much dependence on those two markets. This opportunity has just come our way to try to truly diversify away from too much heavy dependence on those two markets, and what Representative Woolard is trying to do with this Amendment will afford us that opportunity. We ask for your help once again."

Speaker McPike: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, "Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 277?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Lang 'aye'. Have all voted? all voted who wish? Representative. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are 108 'ayes', 4 'nos'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 277. This Bill has received the Constitutional Majority and is thereby declared passed. State and Local government. Third Reading. Appears House Bill 17, Representative Lang. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. House 50, Representative Kulas. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 50, a Bill for an Act in relationship to medical and family responsibility leave. Third Reading of the Bill."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. House Bill 50 is a Bill that we've passed out of these chambers a number of times and we're going to try to again this year. For those of, the new Members have not familiar with the Bill, I'll just to highlight the main points of the Bill. House Bill 50 creates the Illinois Family Responsibility and Medical Leave Act. Ιt would require an employer with 50 or more employees grant up to 8 weeks of unpaid leave I stress, unpaid leave over a 24-month period to certain employees for the birth of a child, the adoption or foster placement of a child or the illness of the employee or his child, spouse or parent. Employees eligible for leave under the Bill must have been employed at least 12 consecutive months by the employer and they must work at least 20 hours per week. It would require the employers to continue the employee's health insurance coverage, but at the employee's expense. is a Bill which we have debated on this floor a number of If you look at the Board now you will notice that it is a bipartisan Bill. We have a...one of the Chief Co-Sponsor is a Republican, Representative Barnes. won't be voting today, but the last time we passed this Bill, 9 Republicans voted for this Bill. So, this isn't a Party position, this is a Bill which is important to every segment of the people of the State of Illinois and I would be glad to answer any questions and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker McPike: "And on that Motion, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this

piece of legislation. This is another idea or a solution

which can do nothing but hurt its intended beneficiaries.

It can do nothing but hurt its intended beneficiaries. It

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

inherently discriminatory because the only people who can take advantage of it are those that need it the Those who can afford to take unpaid leave. It will hurt those who need help the most because to the extent a cost on the employer, that cost will be spread over the entire employee population. So, you will those who need it the least, you will hurt those who need it the most. That is precisely what this Bill will Rather, than make life a little easier for the yuppies, why don't we encourage, why don't we say 'yes' there are exceptional circumstances which should be honored, but not it with a sledgehammer, a traditional over-regulatory approach. Let's get a little innovative, let's get a little iventive, let's say to the employer, take into account those who need it the most, but you do it, you do it through collective bargaining. You do it through your employee relationships. We have the most sophisticated labor market incentive laws in the world. This unnecessary government intrusion. It's going to hurt precisely those of whom the Sponsor wishes to help."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess I look at it from a perspective of being a small employer. But, I'm really thinking about the effects in an everyday business that some of us maybe lose sight of. One of the concerns I have is that I have in my payroll department, if you will, people that are there because they are responsible for seeing that the payroll and all the records are met every Friday, submit it to the computer to get all the paychecks and everything else and I would really be hard-pressed in my small company if that employee decides to come up to me and say 'I want the next eight weeks off every Friday.' If I couldn't stop that that would really be tough on a small

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

company and it seems like right now what they do is say, 'I need so many days off' or 'I have to do this' and we say, we'll get somebody to cover for you, we'll do what 'fine. we can, and we're able to work it out, and we always have. As far as I know most small businesses and medium size businesses, who don't have extra people always have like two people to do a job, they only have one person. That's a key person, a key individual and when that one person is gone, they don't really have a bevy of people walking through that they can call to do that. Like one welder, one computer operator, some of us only have that because we're medium size. When we get to the point that I can't even control that that one person will be gone in the next 24 months, a total of 40 days, with no controls or stopping that, that's really tough. That's a little bit too far of trying to help people trying to do together because that...we're not opposed to that. I don't think anybody who's in the work place wants to do that, but, Ladies and Gentlemen, when you end up having this discriminatory type of thing saying that you must do this, you have to hold that job open. The heck with all the other employees, let somebody else pick up the cost. That's not fair, that's not right, and for those reasons, I think this Bill should not pass."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. One of the most important constituencies affected by this Bill are families with young children. There are lot of families today where both parents feel they have to work for financial reasons. One of the major reasons for that is because that group has had the biggest increase in tax burden that any other group in our society in the last 25 years. Before, we try to solve a problem by going off

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

in some direction to help this group, we really ought to find out what the nature of the problem is. Why not reduce the tax burden on the family with little children to the point where they have a true choice about whether or not both parents have to work? You will then find out how serious the problem is and then we can decide whether we need to do this kind of thing or not. I agree with the other objectives to this Bill and their reasons, but at least this part of it should be delayed until we provide the proper tax relief for families with little children and I recommend that we take them out of the Bill and vote 'no' on this, on the Bill itself."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in support of this Bill. Let me just tell you about study recently done by people in economics at Cornell University and the University of Connecticut. finding is that permitting workers unpaid leave of up to three or four months is cheaper for companies than firing or letting them quit and hiring permanent In fact, for companies with replacements. somewhere between 50 and 100 employees, there's a net savings of \$30.66 if this Bill were to pass. For larger companies may cost them a penny, like \$1.20. So, if the argument that people are making that says that this is bad for business, that it seems to me, is just crocodile tears, it isn't even true. Good, strong, sound economics people, company offices, should come to realize that providing family and medical leave is good for their business, cheaper for their business than not and in the long run creates a stable, a loyal and a productive work But, let me speak for just a moment about the real point of this Bill which is not economics, it's compassion and it's

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

family. We all like to think we are pro-family people, I can't imagine that there is an individual on this floor who a questionnaire wouldn't say, 'yes I'm pro-family; yes, I support family values; and yes, I work in Springfield to promote the family in this State.' What we're talking about here is precisely an opportunity to put our votes where our mouths are. Think about the family with a seriously ill child, perhaps a child that is dying, think about parents unable to spend time with that child or risk instead the loss of the job they need to support the other children at home. Think about a woman whoes children have grown and whoes father-in-law or mother becomes seriously who needs to help care for that woman or that father. The woman, who at that point in her life, might find it very difficult at the age of 50 or 45 or 53 to go out and find another job because, Members of this chamber, there still is age and gender discrimination in the work place. So this Bill is about compassion, it's about making sure that our families do what families are meant to do and that provide care, comfort and support to their members who are ill, their members who are in need and in trouble we care about families and if we're aware about of actual cost consequences, I think we'll all decide the only vote for House Bill 50 is a 'yes' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was looking at the file and noticed the position paper of one of the business groups that apparently has convinced many Members on the other side of the aisle to a, to a reflexively vote in opposition to this Bill year in and year out. And after hearing some of the arguments, the strained arguments, from the other side as to the rationale for voting 'no', I would think that it would almost be an embarrasement for you. This

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

position paper says that 92% of the employers that they represent are against this Bill and only 5% are for it and then they go on to say, but these employers believe that providing these benefits in most cases is good sound business judgment. In fact, 3/4 of these employers already provide family leave benefits. And then they go on to say that, however, this Bill would have a disastrous cost impact on small business. Now, I'm trying to follow the logic of that. That they think it's good sound business practice, that over 3/4 of them already have it, but if we do this, it's going to be disastrous for business. That is a pretty strange rationale. I recently had a secretary in my District Office, my only employee, had a child She asked for eight weeks off, and we found someone to come in and fill in. It was a minor inconvenience to us. It was certainly necessary for her and I thought about she had come in and I said as an employer, 'No, I'm not going to give you the time off, you're fired, you're out of here, I'm replacing you. I mean, can you imagine, making kind of a decision and I only had one employee. Bill applies to companies that have at least 50 employees. Where the inconvenience would be the almost nil. if they can't find some other employee, out of the for this person who is gone on unpaid leave for eight weeks, then they've got a problem that goes beyond Bill. So, this is, this is just, it's such a decent Bill, it makes so much sense that although this employer group may have 95% of its members opposed to this Bill, if you flip the question and you ask your constituents whether they're for this Bill, I would submit that you'll get better that are for it. So, I guess, the question that is here today on this vote is whether you're going to support 95% of your constituents, who want you to vote

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

'yes', or whether you're going support the 5% or the percent of these employers who have taken this illogical position, to urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill. So, I think this vote says a lot about who we represent and we're made of down here."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is put. Representative Kulas to close."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As one of the previous speakers mentioned, under this legislation, 92% of the employers in the State of Illinois would be excempt, so this Bill isn't hurting the small businessmen. This Bill was vetoed twice by Governor Jim Thompson, and you know what his only reason was for vetoing this Bill? The only reason because he knew there was no cost involved in this Bill. His only reason, vetoing the Bill, was that this is something that should be taken care of at the bargaining table. Well, let's face it, a lot of people are not union members, a lot of people are not represented at the bargaining table. This is a Bill, which is in the interest of every person in the State of Illinois. I mean, two years ago, when I introduced this Bill, there were only three industrialized nations in the world which did not have some type of family leave. You know what they were Botswana, South Africa and the United States. Today, there's only one nation and that nation is the United States. It's a national disgrace, for United States to be the only nation, industrialized world, not to have some type of family leave policy. So, I think that it's in our interest to lead,

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

the State of Illinois, to show the other states who passed a family leave Bill, that we're in the forefront, we represent the little people. This isn't a 'yuppie' Bill. I don't represent 'yuppies', although in my new district I might get a few. But, let's face it, Ladies and Gentlemen, all the money in the world will not educate our children, it will not reduce crime, curtail the use of drugs, until we bring back the family as the nucleus of our The family performs various valuable functions members. It provides emotional and psychological security. In its economic roll, the family provides food, shelter, clothing, and physical security for its members, many of whom are too young or too old to provide Politically, the family can promote order and stability within the society as a whole. The modern family today, Ladies and Gentlemen, that has emerged since the Second World War is different from that which existed earlier. We no longer have the father as the breadwinner and the mother as the homemaker. Now, it takes two incomes for a family to keep its head above water. Many wives now work and pursue public careers. Just as many husbands now share the duties involved in maintaining a household and raising a family. Statistics bear out these assertations. Today, 57% of all mothers with children under the age 3 hold jobs outside the home, as compared to only 12% in 1950. By the year 2000, more than half of the work force will consist of women and more than 80% of these women will be mothers. But, this isn't just a women's issue, this is a gender neutral issue. This is for everyone, men, women, the aged, the young. It's good for business. It's good for everyone in the State of Illinois. I ask for your favorable vote on House Bill 50."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 50 pass?'

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'.
Representative Pullen, one minute to explain your vote."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this Bill is is an employment preference Bill for single people. Because it discourages employers from hiring family people because their costs are going to be higher for those people than they will be for the single 'yuppie'. It is indeed a 'yuppie' Bill, not because the 'yuppies' will take advantage of family leave but because they will be the only ones employed. Vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I don't think anybody this chamber, wants to vote against this Bill or this concept. I think it's a great idea. All I would ask to do is to keep in mind that you're mandating something What may be good and that over the entire state. desirable and needed in one company may not be good, needed nor desired in another. It's best to leave benefit plans up to the collective bargaining system. I would simply remind you, those of you on a border district, like I am. Indiana is very aggressive. Indiana is not going to have this policy. The best pro-family kind of environment we could create, in Illinois, is a job for everyone who wants it and if we continue to mandate costly benefits and not give the flexibility of business and labor to work out what benefit plans are important to them, we'll simply drive more jobs out of this state. And there isn't anything pro-family about that. I don't find any great pleasure in voting against this Bill, I like the concept. I've spent time in a hospital. I know how important..."

Speaker McPike: "Finish, Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I've been through this. Believe me, if you leave it up to business and labor

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

to work out what's important to them, they'll settle this. One of you people said 75% have already done so without our help, we don't need to mandate this. In the long run, it will hurt, not help."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Shaw. One minute to explain your vote."

Shaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House.

I was sorry to see debate cut off, because I wanted to ask a more fundamental question about this of the Sponsor and I might ask that now. How does this Bill affect Representative Flowers in this Bill? Will she be affected by this Bill? That's what I really wanted to know about this Bill. Is she entitled to, does she have to run 24 months from now, or can she just take a leave?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kulas. One minute to explain your vote."

Kulas: "To answer the Gentleman's question: All state employees have family leave, so Representative Flowers would be entitled although if she wasn't a state employee, she wouldn't be entitled."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a good time to remind the General Assembly of the two Republican induced recessions. The recession of 1982 and '83 where over a million people lost their jobs and this recession of '90, '91, that the Republicans don't want to call a depression. People, because of the job erosion and the techniques of the Reagan, Bush Administrations, jobs are being out sourced to foreign nations for the minimum wage. Now the American worker, to maintain our standard of living, both members of the family have to work, and they're so concerned about their job that they need an emergency leave in case something happens so that they can leave without

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

losing their job. You guys have lost sight of that. And, it doesn't cost the taxpayers of the United States a single penny to grant this emergency leave. And now the President οf the United States wants a free agreement, he wants the fast-track agreement, so that more jobs can be sent to foreign countries. You guys have got your head in the sand. You guys don't want to call this recession a depression. It's a depression. so...more bankruptcies today than there ever was in our history. More failures than ever before in our history. These people need to protect their jobs."

Speaker McPike: "Representive Mautino. One minute."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen the House. I think everyone in this General Assembly realizes that the State of Illinois, the City of Chicago, and the employers of this state, have adhered to this policy since there was a little skirmish called 'Desert Shield' and 'Desert Storm'. All employees, in the State of Illinois, that served their country in 'Desert Storm' have been granted family military leave in this State. legislation does no more than is the actual practice in this state at this time. To deny that the statute embodying that same information and that same procedure is utterly ridiculous."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Real briefly, I know that normally a freshman should be seen and not heard, but I feel as though this is one of the most important pieces of legislation, that I will take up as a Freshman in the General Assembly. I think that when we talk about this being a vacation for 'yuppies', I don't agree. We're talking about a dying parent, we're talking a newborn child. It's important to the people of this state.

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

It's important to the people of the United States, to spend time with their families. I understand that 75% of the businesses already do it, but that's the point. There's 25% who don't. That's why this Bill needs to be passed. That's why I think it should be a fundamental right in the State of Illinois. The people should have time to be with their families and that's why I'm proud to vote 'yes' for this great piece of legislation."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think all of the speeches for this piece of legislation have certainly been excellent, but no one has spoken of the issue of bonding. The first four to eight weeks of a baby's life, he or she forms bonding with that parent or guardian. Even for children who are adopted, it is extremely significant that bonding take place during those extremely early days or early weeks of birth. I think, in order to have children who develop a sense of self, security and self—esteem, those first eight weeks are significantly important. And congratulations to all the new mothers, the new fathers, grandmothers and grandfathers in the State Legislature. I think that this is an excellent piece of legislation to develop healthy children in the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

It's kind of interesting to think that in eight weeks we can teach and learn how to become a family when we can't even get legislation passed to get it passed and to be supported in our educational system. One of the reasons that people say that we have to have two people work in our system is because we in government have created so many laws and mandates that require business to implement additional costs that we can't afford to buy the items

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

anymore. This is a particular area that, for example, the young man or young lady who then works for eight weeks as a replacement then is left to go somewhere else. That business assumes the cost of unemployment insurance, and I think that's unfair. The state and government should not be involved in mandating fringes, benefits that could, in fact, should be discussed through the bargaining agreement process. So, Ladies and Gentleman, let's not fool ourselves. We all are interested in families, but certainly this is not...(inaudible)"

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 76 'ayes' and 38 'nos'. House Bill 50 having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 69, Representative Brunsvold. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 69, a Bill for an Act to amend the Emergency Telephone System Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

House Bill 69 address the 911 system in this state. In

1987 we passed, I passed a Bill that provided a funding

mechanism for the 911 programs, and earlier this year in

March we had a meeting of providers for 911, the ICC, fire,

police, telephone companies. Representative Ackerman was

there from the other side of the aisle. City officials,

municipal league, and there have been some problems that

need to be addressed. This Bill, this Bill tries to answer

those and is an Agreed Bill between these individuals.

Amendment #1 does the following things: First item would

require accessibility to the hearing, the hearing—impaired;

Two, it also calls for the privacy waiver if one dials 911;

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Number three, the county implementing 911 must include the whole county; Number four, automatic dialers are prohibited under this legislation; Number five, it addresses the make-up of the board. Last year Representative Olson included a private member on the board. This legislation now would, would set the minimum limit at five. Three must be public safety providers. One, a public, as I indicated, a public citizen, and then the main part of the change is that elected officials may now serve on the board. six, all funds must be put in interest-bearing accounts; Number seven, that the data base must be within one percent accurate, and the second Amendment deals with county board officials in allowing them also to serve on a 911 Board. That's the make-up of House Bill 699, or 669. I would answer any questions."

Speaker McPike: "Does anyone stand in opposition? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Represen...On this Bill there are 113 'ayes' and no 'nays'. House Bill 69 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 72, Representative Cowlishaw. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 72..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative White. Let the record indicate that Representative White wished to vote 'yes' on House Bill 69. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 72, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the installation of sprinkler systems in school buildings. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Mr., Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave please to return this Bill temporarily to the Order of Second Reading in

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

order to adopt an Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Does the Lady have leave? Hearing no objections, the Bill's on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Please..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Please withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker McPike: "The Lady withdraws Amendment #1. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Cowlishaw."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All Amendment #2 does is to add an effective date of July 1, 1992, and remove the provision that the State Fire Marshal would have to review the installation plans for sprinkler systems since the State Fire Marshal does not set those standards and did not want to be obliged to have to review the plans. That's all the Amendment does. I move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. You can, Representative Cowlishaw, you can call the Bill on Third Reading at this time, but I, it requires 71 votes now that it's been amended."

Cowlishaw: "I beg your pardon."

Speaker McPike: "It requires 71 votes since it was amended today, instead of 60. Do you wish to call the Bill or do you wish

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

to wait for another day?"

Cowlishaw: "I'll go with it today, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Cowlishaw: "If I may, please."

Speaker McPike: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 72, a Bill for an Act relating to the installation of sprinkler systems in school buildings. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and you Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was debated and, discussed very thoroughly in the Educational Committee and came out of the committee 18 to 0. committee hearing Representative Keane mentioned something that I have since investigated rather carefully. He said that he favored this legislation because when you put a sprinkler system in a building, you can use less fire-retardant materials and actually save money so that the cost of the construction of the entire building is lower rather than higher. I have since investigated that with the State Fire Marshal and every fire service group in the State of Illinois and have determined that one of reasons for changing the effective date for this Bill was to permit the State Board to change the standards for construction of schools in the event that those schools have a sprinkler system. The fact is that with a sprinkler system, and with, if they adopt standards similar to the national standards for sprinkler buildings, actually those school buildings would cost less money per square foot to build than they do under the current standards without a sprinkler system, and I have here a letter from the State Fire Marshal affirming that fact. This Bill is endorsed by State Board of Education, the Chicago Board of the

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Education, the Illinois Federation of Teachers, the Illinois Education Association. I know of no opponents, and I move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "And on that, Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Yeah, will the Sponsor yield for a question, please?" Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Granberg: "Representative Cowlishaw, you are concerned as I am about state mandates."

Cowlishaw: "Absolutely."

Granberg: "I noticed on the Calendar that this is a state mandate's Bill."

Cowlishaw: "That is correct."

Granberg: "And I know you and I feel the same way about mandating to local..."

Cowlishaw: "You bet."

Granberg: "...and not reimbursing. Can you tell me what the status of this is? How much is this gonna cost the school districts, or..."

Cowlishaw: "No, no. Well, let me explain once again what I, what thought I had explained in the, in the initial presentation. Because of a remark made by Representative Keane in the committee about the fact that you can use less expensive, less fire retardant materials in a building that has a sprinkler system than you otherwise could, I followed up on that and talked with the various fire service groups throughout the state: the Illinois fire chiefs, the Illinois fire inspectors, the State Fire Marshal's Office, and so on, and asked that they all consult with one another and look at those national standards that, that set different fire-retardant requirements for materials in construction if there is a sprinkler system going to be installed. The consensus from all those groups was that, in fact, the, if you had to keep the same standards and

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

you, you put in a sprinkler system, it would cost you about \$2.00 a square foot more. But if you changed the standards so that you don't have to use such highly fire retardant materials because you don't need them in a sprinkler building, you save something between \$5.00 and \$5.50 a square foot. Consequently, this isn't going to cost, cause the cost of any new school building, to increase. It will decrease the cost of the school building. It will provide much better fire protection than you would have without a sprinkler system, and just to affirm that, in fact, there is a savings rather than a cost, I have this letter here from the State Fire Marshal affirming that."

Granberg: "Thank you."

- Speaker McPike: "The Chair has a number of people wishing to speak. Does anyone stand in opposition to this Bill? Mr. Ropp, you're in opposition. Your light's not even on. No. Representative DeJaegher."
- DeJaegher: "Representative, you left the General Assembly knowledgeable of people that were supporting your concept.

 I believe it's a remarkable concept, but I also have a letter from the Farm Bureau regarding House Bill 72 to take issue with that because of the cost that would be imposed upon these school systems. Has the Farm Bureau changed their minds pertaining to this piece of legislation?"
- Cowlishaw: "Rep...Representative DeJaegher, I have, I, I apologize to you. I had meant to go and talk to the people at the Farm Bureau, 'cause I, I too have a copy of that letter. I simply haven't had time, but I am confident that once they have the same information that I have been provided by the State Fire Marshal and all the other fire service groups throughout the state, that they will remove that opposition. The, the Farm Bureau, in general, is in favor of making anything in government more efficient and

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

less costly. That's what this does for brand new schools, it makes them more efficient and less costly."

DeJaegher: "What, what you're, basically is true pertaining to the Farm Bureau, but hopefully that you'll consider not calling this Bill, and hopefully that you will meet with the Farm Bureau to resolve this situation. I would en...I would encourage you to solicit their support in this endeavor, and I think that if you could get their support, I think that it would reprove the status of the downstate legislators, especially who are concerned about farm related issues and their concerns."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cowlishaw, the Chair misspoke a while ago, it requires 71 votes to hear the Bill immediately, and once you get 71 votes to hear the Bill immediately, it only requires 60 votes to pass the Bill. So the Chair misspoke. So the Lady asks leave to hear the Bill immediately. Does the Lady have leave? Proceed. Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield for questions?"

McPike: "Yes."

Cowlishaw: "Yes, of course."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Cowlishaw, the Amendment #1 that was adopted a few minutes ago..."

Cowlishaw: "Yes."

Satterthwaite: "...gives the review of the plans and specifications to the State Board of Education."

Cowlishaw: "That is correct."

Satterthwaite: "...and yet our digest indicates that according to the State Board of Education, there will in fact be an increased construction cost. Now, I know that you have said that the Fire Marshal's Office and others indicate that there would not be..."

Cowlishaw: "Wait."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

- Satterthwaite: "...and that there might be less. Has the Board of Education agreed with that?"
- Cowlishaw: "Now, now, Representative, I need to explain to you that the State Board of Education does take the position, as do I, that if they did not change the standards for construction of buildings that were going to be sprinklered, those buildings would cost more."
- Satterthwaite: "But my concern is, however, it is the State Board who has given us an estimate of increased cost and now they are the agency given the opportunity to review those plans and specifications, and I'm wondering whether they have agreed with the Fire Marshal's Office that, in fact, their fiscal note is now improper."
- Cowlishaw: "It is my understanding from discussing this with Dave
 Carey that there is some kind of an advisory group already
 in place that advises the State Board of Education on
 things that have to do with construction and that that
 group would be consulted about changing these standards for
 qhe construction of schools so that less fire-retardant
 materials could be used, but I think they feel they want to
 let that advisory committee have some input into that
 before they would reach a decision."
- Satterthwaite: "Thank you. You indicate then that your expectation is that this legislation will not result in increased cost to school districts for construction of new buildings or substantial renovations."
- Cowlishaw: "That is correct. Representative, it is not only my understanding that it will not cost more, it is my understanding that it will cost..."

Satterthwaite: "It may cost less."

Cowlishaw: "...less, and there is not..."

Satterthwaite: "And it is not your intent then that we take any other..."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Cowlishaw: "No."

Satterthwaite: "...earmarked funds..."

Cowlishaw: "No."

Satterthwaite: "...of State revenue to help to pay for this."

Cowlishaw: "No, and I would point out to you, Representative Satterthwaite, that not only would the building cost less, if you follow the State Board of Education adopts the kinds of standards that are pretty much..."

Satterthwaite: "Right."

Cowlishaw: "...I, I guess agreed to. But, of course, the cost for fire insurance goes down too."

Satterthwaite: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Will the Lady yield for a question?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Cowlishaw: "Yes."

Hartke: "Representative Cowlishaw, does this Act repeal the National Fire Protection Association Standard 13-1987 or the Uniform Building Code Standard 38-1?"

Cowlishaw: "This doesn't repeal anything at all. It simply puts into the School Code a requirement that when you build a brand new school building, or when you build an addition to a school building that will add at least 50% more to the size of the building, that you must install a sprinkler system in that new construction. That's all it does. It does not repeal anything."

Hartke: "Well, it's my understanding that those two Acts would exempt public buildings if from the, the Uniform Fire Safety Act provided those buildings were equipped with a sprinkler system."

Cowlishaw: "Oh, Representative Hartke, I think I understand.

There has always been, I think, among Legislators and the general public, a misunderstanding about why it is that

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

schools in communities or counties that have these kinds of local ordinances are not required to have sprinkler systems, and the answer is, that schools are not subject to local ordinances. Schools are not subject to many of the things that other public buildings are subject to. They are subject only to what applies in the School Code and to the standards for construction established by the State Board of Education."

Hartke: "Are not our penal institutions considered schools?"

Cowlishaw: "I don't believe that they fall under the provisions of the School Code."

Hartke: "What about child care centers?"

Cowlishaw: "I don't believe those fall under the provisions of the School Code either."

Hartke: "Thank you, Representative."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Hartke, this..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Curran."

Cowlishaw: "...this Bill is endorsed by the AFLCIO, and I can't believe that it would have any problem with, you know, with what you're, I think I understand what you mean."

Curran: "Representative Cowlishaw, is this your first Bill? Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this obviously good piece of legislation. This Lady has researched this well. She has crafted it well. She has brought us a piece of legislation which could make our schools safer. They can be constructed at a lower cost. I, I stand in support of this legislation, and I..."

Unknown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Lady yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Unknown: "Representative, I'm, I'm not certain I'm against the legislation, but I do have a question about the mechanics of it. I, I note that, that the plan, the sprinkler plan must be approved by the State Board of Education. Why

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

does, why is that necessary?"

Cowlishaw: "Well, it's my understanding that right now because of the fact that the school, that schools, when you build a new school or put on an addition or anything, they have to comply with the School Code. Already anything like that has to be approved by the State Board of Education."

Cowlishaw: "That is correct. That is correct."

Unknown: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Cowlishaw: "Yes."

Ropp: "Representative, how many school fires have we had in the last decade?"

Cowlishaw: "Well, I know of one that I, well first of all there was one in Bolingbrook which fortunately occurred at night, destroyed an elementary school. But it, fortunately there wasn't, there was no injury because it occurred at night, and then there was, there was Warren Township High School in Representative Frederick's district."

Ropp: "Okay."

Cowlishaw: "Which was totally destroyed by fire, and although there was no loss of life, and I don't believe there was any serious injury..."

Ropp: "Okay."

Cowlishaw: "The fact is that those students had to be farmed out to wherever they could find a place to teach them for more than a two-year period while they tried to arrange to get the funding and to get the high school replaced and that kind of thing, and I, from what I have heard from

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Representative Frederick and other people who live in that area of the state, the disruption in that community and the disruption to those students' education was almost incredible."

Ropp: "Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Representative Cowlishaw, I certainly respect sincerity and interest. The problem that I have with this particular issue is one that has been brought to me nearly every school superintendent in my district, and that is, after these sprinklers are put in, laudible as that may fact is that there are some students for some interesting reason have a chance that they can trip those sprinklers off and cause amouts of tremendous water damage in the school building, in the classroom, in the library, that costs far exceed even the cost of putting in the sprinkler, and so I bring to this Body the concern that many of my superintendents have, not that we're trying to say we're going to prevent any major loss of fire. concern is far greater with the potential loss of water damage, and I just want the Body here to be cautious of that particular element, even though the intent is very There is potential cost by young people, high, maybe even in high school, that might just like to see the sprinkler go off and see what happens classroom the next day or the next week when they come back in the class. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Pedersen: "I assume that if you're putting sprinklers in an existing building that there's, that it..."

Cowlishaw: "This does not call for sprinklers to be put in any existing building, Representative."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Pedersen: "I understand. We're talking about installing though in an existing building. It costs more to install, right?"

Cowlishaw: "Oh, to retrofit?"

Pedersen: "Yes."

Cowlishaw: "Yes, that is very costly. This Bill does not call for that."

Pedersen: "Alright, I understand. Alright, now you're talking about the cost, you're talking about remodeling a building.

Does it cost more to put, put the sprinklers in the remodeled portion because it's already existing?"

Cowlishaw: "I don't understand your question."

Pedersen: "Well, if you're remodeling up to 50% of a building, you're not really tearing it down, it's already there, and you, you have to sprinkle it. Is it going to cost more?"

Cowlishaw: "No, no, that's for an addition that adds at least 50% to the building."

Pedersen: "There, there's no language in there about remodeling?"

Cowlishaw: "I don't believe so."

Pedersen: "So...you're talking about putting a sprinkler in just in, in the additions."

Cowlishaw: "Just in the new construction. That's all. Because I. I..."

Pedersen: "Not in the old, not in the old part?"

Cowlishaw: "No, if the intent is only that, that which is newly constructed would have a sprinkler system."

Pedersen: "And not in the remodeled portion."

Cowlishaw: "No."

Pedersen: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?

Representative, is this a mandate?"

Cowlishaw: "I'm sorry. I can't hear you."

Davis: "Is this another mandate?"

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Cowlishaw: "Yes, Ma'am, this is a requirement."

Davis: "This is a requirement. Now my question is, the City of Chicago must already build under a code, a city code."

Cowlishaw: "The City of Chicago is not included in this legislation."

Davis: "Chicago is excluded?"

Cowlishaw: "That is correct. It, there were requests that that be done, and I complied with those requests."

Davis: "Thank you very much. But this is a downstate mandate, is that right?"

Cowlishaw: "That is correct."

Davis: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a parochial school district in mind. they're planning on expanding that school district. They have told me the cost of fulfilling this mandate is gonna cost them a lot of money, and they quite frankly have a problem with it. It's been respectfully pointed out to me that, in fact, the sprinkler system is installed to save property. It is not there to save lives. By the time a fire is burning enough for a sprinkler system to go in, you would have lost a lot of people. But quite frankly what happens is the people leave and get out of those schools long before those sprinkler systems ever, ever go on, and that is the point I think Representative Ropp is pointing out, is once that system goes on, you have a serious flooding problem. Yes, you might be able to save a building or two but I would rather give the citizens who elected those school boards the option of deciding whether or not they want to go to the taxpayer and ask for more money to put in a sprinkler system. responsibility as elected officials. We've been talking

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

about mandates in this state, and again we are mandating to a school district saying, 'We as a government have more smarts than you, the local elected official, who has to go to the taxpayers and ask for more money to pay sprinkler system that is not gonna save lives. It's just gonna save property and buildings.' That is the local school district's responsibility. Though this Bill is well-intended, it is a new mandate. It's gonna cost school systems more money. It's gonna cost parochial schools that are strapped as it is, the cost of this system. Let decide, let them, duly elected, let that church body decide that that's the kind of money they want to spend. unfortunately I'm not gonna support this sorry, new mandated program."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cowlishaw to close."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to tell you a brief story that true. It was related by a Fire Chief in the Lisle-Woodrich Fire Protection District and he has all the documentation. Back in about 1950, a school called Our Lady of the Angels, in the City of Chicago, burned. It was totally destroyed, and there was a lot of loss of life, and I'm sure that none us who were alive at that time have ever forgotten the pictures that appeared in newspapers of that fire at Our Lady of the Angels School. Approximately four months later a school in suburban Cook County, designed almost exactly like Our Lady of the Angels, caught fire. The fire began the very same kind of place, a basement stairwell. The difference was that that suburban school had a sprinkler It had been installed 50 years before. It had system. never been used and it had never been tested. sprinkler system came on and put out that fire. There was no injury. There was no loss of life, and those students

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

didn't lose a single day of instructional time, not even an hour. If it is true, which I doubt, that all that sprinkler systems do is save buildings and not lives, then I say, 'We certainly ought to pass this,' because if the example of Warren Township High School is before us, we realize that to have students lose their school means that their education is seriously disrupted. For those reasons and many others, Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of House Bill 72 as amended."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote, 'aye', opposed voted 'noe'. Have all voted?

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 84 'ayes', 22 'nos'. House Bill 72 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. That Bill was on 'Short Debate'. House Bill 101, Representative Capparelli. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. You want this in the record or out? Read the...Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, I think that Representative Steczo would like to make a Motion on, on one of the Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "You want to bring this back to second?"

Capparelli: "Please bring it back to Second Reading."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman asks leave to bring the Bill back to
Second Reading. Second Reading. No objections. The
Bill's on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments, Mr.
Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments pending."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, I move to table Amendment #3 to House Bill 101."

Speaker McPike: "Is that your Amendment?"

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Steczo: "No."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #3. Is there any discussion? Being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be tabled?' All, Representative Black. Mr. Black. Mr...Never Mind. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be tabled?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is tabled. Any further Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Motions."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 101, a Bill for an Act in relation to civic centers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 101 amends the Metropolitan Civic Center Support Act, provides that all future financial aid to civic centers would be on an interest free loan paid back in 15 years. Amendment #2, I think was Wojcik's, would, which would father (sic facor) in those civic centers that were okayed last year, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker McPike: "And on that, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. If the Gentleman intends to move for immediate consideration in taking it from Second to Third, we'll object. I think the rules clearly state that he would need 71 votes to move it back to Third today. We'd kinda like an opportunity to look at some Amendments on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black, you only need 71 votes to call the Bill on Third Reading if an Amendment is adopted. There was no Amendment adopted to this. Amendment was tabled. The Gentleman doesn't have the 71 vote requirement. So proceed on the Bill. discussion on this Bill? Being no, Representative

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Balanoff, do you want to..."

Balanoff: "Will, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Balanoff: "Does this in any way or will it in any way affect the expansion of McCormick Place?"

Capparelli: "No."'

Balanoff: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 63 'ayes', 49 'noes'. House Bill 101 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 276, Representative Matijevich. Out of the record. House Bill 288, Representative Santiago. Out of the record. House Bill 351, Representative Stern. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 351, a Bill for an Act..."

Speaker McPike: "Excuse me, excuse me, out of the record.

Representative Williams."

- Williams: "Yes, I just stand with a, a personal privilege. I'd

 like to recognize a former Representative, Louis H.

 Caldwell, down in the front aisle, one of the original

 members of the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus, and my

 cousin."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Stern, do you wish 352 called?
 Okay, Representative Rice, 353. House Bill 353. Out of
 the record. 54. Out of the record. Mr. Rice. House Bill
 477, Representative McAfee. Out of the record. House Bill
 518, Representative Steczo. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 518, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Steczo."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 518 amends the laws that relates to the Cook County Sheriff's office and simply gives the board, the Merit Board, the power to return an accused deputy sheriff to duty during any phase of an administrative hearing process if the board feels that that action is appropriate. It is intended to reduce the amount of back pay and other things that occurs when reinstatements are made. I would ask any, answer any questions that Members of the House might have or would ask for, Mr. Speaker, 'yes' votes on, on, on the Motion to pass this Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Any discussion on this? Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?

 Representative Steczo, is this an initiative of the Cook

 County Sheriff?"
- "Steczo: "I'm sorry, Representative Wennlund. Repeat that, please."
- Wennlund: "Is this an initiative of the Cook County Sheriff?" Steczo: "Yes, it is."
- Wennlund: "Has the State's Attorney, Cook County State's

 Attorney, taken a position on this, do you know?"
- Steczo: "Not that I'm aware of. I'm not sure he needs to."
- Wennlund: "How would, how would this affect the Los Angeles example in Chicago in the event of a police brutality charge? He'd be allowed to return to work?"
- Steczo: "Well, I think, I think the issue that was brought to our attention by the sheriff's office is that, in many of these cases when, when somebody is accused of a relatively minor, I wouldn't, I would not consider Los Angeles to be minor, a minor offense, that officer is not allowed to return until the entire administrative hearing plays out. That has caused the sheriff's office in the County of Cook to have,

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

to have problems with back pay issues and other things. Yet the administrative people who are hearing the, the objection or the case, pretty much can tell whether or not the person legitimately will, will, will either be found innocent or will be allowed to go back to work. This allows them that, that, that ability in those cases to let the person back early."

Wennlund: "So it's designed to save money?"

Steczo: "Absolutely."

Wennlund: "We think it's a good Bill. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. this Bill there are 109 'ayes' and 3 'noes'. House Bill 518 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 536, Representative Santiago. Read the Bill...No, out of the record. 575, House Bill Representative Currie. Ms. Currie. House Bill 890. Representative Bugielski. House Bill 968, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 968, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move for the passage of House Bill 968. House Bill 968, as is the case with 970 which follows and 971 which follows that, are vehicle Bills which will be used for pension legislation as we progress down through the 87th General Assembly Session. I would move for passage of House Bill 968."

Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? Rep...Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Chair, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Since this is a shell Bill for future

43rd Legislative Day

- May 2, 1991
- pension work, we have no idea ultimately what will be on this Bill so I might suggest to my Republican colleagues that we may want to vote 'present' on this until we can truly see what the Bill will look like."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 72 'ayes' and 2 'noes'. House Bill 968 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 970. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 970, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the passage of House
 Bill 970. This is the same process that we have been using
 for a number of years in preparing and structuring the
 Omnibus Pension Bill. I would solicit your support."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise and say that we don't know if there's anything in this Bill that would be averse to us but until we have an idea of what is in it, again I would suggest that my colleagues on the Republican side vote 'present'."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, in response to the remarks that were made. I, I want to commend both the Speaker and Representative Sam Wolf who is Chairman of the Pensions Committee. Anybody who served here many years ago realizes that we were under tremendous heat and rightful criticism.

 All we did no matter who the interest group was and wanted

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

benefits, all we did was say, 'Yeah, we, we'll put in a Bill for you', and everybody voted for it, and we just added benefit after benefit. About five or six years ago, we changed that procedure so that when there are Bills relating to benefits, we put them all together and we have meetings with those pension systems and whoever has to fund those systems and they have to sign off on it. That has been, I think, a very workable system, and it hasn't put us under such pressures and criticisms as we had in the past. Somebody may not like that but believe me for the good of the all and for the good of the systems, it has been much better, and I wanted to commend both the Speaker and Sam Wolf who I think has been doing a great job with that system."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 65 'ayes' and 1 'no'. House Bill 970 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 971, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 971, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I will now move for passage of House Bill 971 and would like to thank Representative Matijevich for his remarks which explains the process very thoroughly and in the meantime, and in the process maybe some of you new Representatives don't realize it, but this process takes one hell of a lot of people on the floor of this House off the hook. I would request your support."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I concur with the remarks made by Representative

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Matijevich that, in fact, this process has worked, it is workable, and again, I also commend the speaker and Representative Wolf in the hard, dedicated work that they have done in developing this process, however, again, we are not privy to the final package, nor is anyone, and therefore, I must respectfully rise and ask my colleagues to vote 'present' until we know what that final Bill would look like. Thank you."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 971 pass?'

 All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all

 voted? Representative McNamara, did you wish to speak?"
- McNamara: "Just a minute to explain my vote. If everyone took that same attitude that we would vote 'present' and wait for the final Bill, there would be no Bill whatsoever, so I just ask them to reevaluate their position on something that is so common sense."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 74 'ayes' and no 'nays'. House Bill 971 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 973, Representative Lang. Out of the record. House 1000, Representative Homer. House Bill 1014. Representative John Dunn. House Bill 1203, Representative Lou Jones. Out of the record. House Bill 1385. Out of the record. House Bill 1685, Representative LeFlore. House Bill 1849, Representative Burke. Mr...Let's go back Representative LeFlore. I didn't see him. Representative LeFlore, House Bill 1685. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1685, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the Metropolitan Transit Authority Employees. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. LeFlore."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Bill 1685 authorizes private carriers and Assembly. transport persons under agreement with the Chicago Transit Authority. This Bill will call for an investigation of personnel through the State...State Police Department. driver application must be authorized and investigated and private carriers must request the investigation from the State Police. No information will be given on a person before the person who is being investigated has been given the proper information, disclosure information. This Bill has been before this House several times. It passed the House and went to the Senate last year, got bogged down with Amendments, and this year I have it back again, and I. would like to have a favorable vote. I'd be willing to answer any questions."

Speaker McPike: "And on the Bill, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question, please."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Pullen: "It is customary when we provide for the Department of State Police to conduct criminal background checks that we also provide for the State Police to be able to charge a fee to the person requesting that background check. Does this legislation also include that provision?"

LeFlore: "Yes. The fees are paid by the Transit Authority."

Pullen: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Proceed."

Pullen: "I'd simply like to comment that I think the Gentleman has a very good piece of legislation, and I hope we can all give it our support. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Black: "Representative, as I understand your Bill, this, this only affects private companies under contract to the Transportation Authority, is that correct?"

LeFlore: "Well, actually Representative, it has an effect on the Chicago Transit Authority. I don't, I didn't see anything in here about private contractors."

Black: "Our..."

LeFlore: "Yeah, I see what you're saying now."

Black: "Okay."

LeFlore: "On line 6..."

Black: "On, on page, it's on page 317."

LeFlore: "On page 17. On page 17?"

Black: "Well, it's also on page 3, line 29, section 28-B. I, as the previous speaker indicated, Representative, I don't think we have a problem with the Bill, but we would like to get that straightened out with you. If you'd pull it out of the record and just let staff get together here for a second. It looks like it is any person applying for a position as a driver of a vehicle owned by a private carrier company which provides public transportation pursuant to an agreement with the Authority, and that's, we're a little confused as to just who, who we're aimed at here."

LeFlore: "Okay. Why don't we take it out of the record."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The Bill's out of the record. House Bill 1849,
Representative Burke. Out of the record. House Bill 2255,
Representative Matijevich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2255, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Police Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

House Bill 2255 is no longer a longevity salary increment

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Bill for the State Police. The Bill was, is for these Trooper _____ of the State Police, and all it does now, it deletes language prohibiting appointment to the State Police Merit Board of a person who has held or has been a candidate for elected public office within one year of the appointment, and I appreciate your support."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? The question is,
 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed
 vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The
 Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 73
 'ayes' and 35 'nos'. House Bill 2255 having received the
 Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House
 Bill 2385, Representative Hensel. Out of the record.
 2553, Representative Hannig. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2553, a Bill for an Act to amend the Comprehensive Review Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In the world that exists outside of these chambers, we find a hierarchy that exists in employment where the lowest person on the totem pole generally receives pay, but as you move up the totem pole all the way to the higher offices to the executives, you soon find that the chief operating officer or the chairman of the board is the highest paid officer, and I think we all probably agree that that makes sense since that individual has all responsibility and has to make the determinations on the course of the future for that company, but here the State of Illinois we have a little bit different approach. I was a little bit shocked to find out that the Governor, the individual who has the most responsibility and who we elect to lead this state for four years, indeed always the highest paid state employee, and this provision

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

in the law, this Bill, would provide that no individual who receives compensation from state funds could be paid more than the Governor. Now for those individuals who are already exceeding that salary, we would simply freeze their salaries. We wouldn't roll them back or cause them any hardships in that respect, but we would freeze their salaries. I think today, especially as we debate budget cuts and we debate finding revenues in the budget, that this is at least one small step that we can take to show the people of the State of Illinois that we're trying to do something to put our economic and fiscal house in order. I think the Bill makes sense and I'd ask for everyone to support it."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Will the Sponsor yield to a few questions?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Currie: "Representative Hannig, can you tell me how many public employees in the state currently earn more than the Governor of the State of Illinois?"

Hannig: "Representative, I don't have, I apologize. I don't know the answer to that question but I do know..."

Currie: "Can you tell me how many employees of state government earn more than the Governor of the State of Illinois?"

Hannig: "I don't have their names, and I don't have the number,

Representative, and I'm not trying to pick on any one
particular individual."

Currie: "No, you're clearly not trying to pick on any one particular position or district, but let me just, to the Bill if I might, Mr. Speaker. It would be my guess that there are large numbers of public employees in the State of Illinois who, in fact, do earn more than the Governor of the State. If you think about people who staff the state

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

medical schools. If you think about the people who are presidents of our state universities. If you think about jobs, even perhaps at the cabinet level, that may be difficult to fill with qualified people unless we're able to hire them in the competitive marketplace, it's my quess that there may be some who today earn more than the Governor of the State of Illinois. You know, a lot of people think it'd be a wonderful job to be Governor. That's why every time there's an election there are plenty of people who are willing to run for the opportunity. isn't the salary that's the major inducement, it's, I think, the perks and the prerogatives and the power of the that make being Governor such a dandy opportunity that you can hardly keep people away from the opportunity file for the post. It may not be such a dandy opportunity to staff the medical schools, to staff the university presidencies, that we'd be able to get qualified people if this Bill were to become law. So my recommendation, Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, is that while this looks like a, a reasonable piece of public policy, I think we would find that we're not going to be able to hire qualified, confident people in a variety of positions in our own state government and certainly throughout the state university systems and in other levels of government across this state. So I think that the right vote on this measure would be a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield? Representative Hannig, in your Bill is there any provision made for other benefits besides salary? The reason I ask the question is that in terms of the Governor, for instance, we provide a Governor's Mansion, we provide him with a staff, we provide him with body guards, we provide him with a budget to run

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

the mansion including food and other kinds of commodities that he chooses to purchase to run the Governor's mansion. Is there any provision in your legislation to add that as a part of the compensation for the Governor?"

Hannig: "Representative, this deals with, simply deals with compensation. We have situations like you said with the Governor. We have other state employees that are highly paid to, that maybe aren't even covered by this proposal, who receive other fringe benefits. But it does not address the question of fringe benefits, but it does address compensation, wages."

Satterthwaite: "Well. my concern is that in addition to the actual salary attached with the Governor's Office there are a substantial number of fringe benefits, and I'm not iust talking about health care and pension. I'm talking about a place to live and the full funding for the operations of that place to live including food and other commodities. Most of the state employees who would have salaries in this range do not have those other advantages, and unless your Bill were to include those other things that are available to the Governor as a part of the calculation, then it seems to me that it's unfair for us to try to make an equivalency one salary and another salary and for that reason and the reasons expressed by some of the others in regard to the fact that this is not, it is not possible for us to have a Governor shop around to get the best salary. Governor can only run in the state of which he is a resident. Whereas people in the medical profession and many of the other professions do not have that kind of limitation and can find their jobs a much more portable activity where they can go where the salary is provided, and so I would recommend that we not legislation."

43rd Legislative Day May 2, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Representative Young."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Young: "Was it your intention for this Bill not only to apply to state government but to all units of local government?"

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct, Representative. It, if you look at
the Bill, it basically states that it applies to any office
or employee of the state or any unit of local government
whose compensation is paid in whole or in part with public
funds."

Young: "So, I'm particularly thinking about the salaries of the Mayor of the City of Chicago, which I think is higher than the Governor's right now. So you would intend for this Bill to apply to him, wouldn't you?"

Hannig: "Representative, the Bill would apply. Now, it's my understanding that the Mayor of Chicago, and you know more about this than I do, he was recently elected, and I under...I believe that by State Constitution would not be eligible for a pay increase anyway until after his next election. Is that correct?"

Young: "And, I'm, I'm not only thinking about the Mayor though, I'm particularly thinking about almost his entire upper cabinet, such as the Chief of Police, and the Head of the Fire Department, and the Chief of Staff, and the Budget Director, and all of those employees make more than the Governor or the Mayor, and the reason they make more than the Governor or the Mayor is because you can't go out and find qualified people to be the Chief of Staff in the City of Chicago or the Chief of Police for the City of Chicago, or the Chief Fireman in the City of Chicago unless you pay them a salary. So, all these cabinet level officials make more than the Mayor does and more than the Governor, and to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, because this Bill would, in fact,

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

create havoc with the city payroll structure in the City of Chicago, I rise in opposition."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig to close."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. We've heard one argument that says that some of these top people don't get fringe benefits, but the truth is that probably more, most of them get at least as much as the Governor and in many cases more. We've heard arguments that we can't find qualified people. Well, you know, I think if you look around the United States and some of other communities you can find qualified people, they're not only just there for the highest pay. I know in a lot of the communities that I represent, we don't this problem in conflict with this Bill. We've got mayors that work for \$50.00 a month. Now, you know, we've I've got the list here, Representative Currie asked for, for, you know how many people are there. There's over or approximately 300 people in the State of Illinois, in all kinds of lines of work, making as much as \$260,000. Now maybe that's all fine and dandy, but the Governor of the State of Illinois is the individual that we elected to be our leader. He is the person that we set higher than all others, and he is the person that, theoretically, think we should pass this Bill and make it law, he is the person that should receive the highest salary. I can't believe that we can't find qualified people that are willing to work for the State of Illinois that would be, would have problems with this provision in the law. This is simply good common sense. Maybe that's one of reasons the State of Illinois sometimes seems to be in a world by itself. This makes sense, and I would ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All

43rd Legislative Day

- May 2, 1991
- those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.
 Representative Levin, explain his vote."
- Levin: "Mr., Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. How many votes does this Bill take to pass?"
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Pollack. Representative Satterthwaite. Representative Levin, it takes 60 votes. Representative Satterthwaite does not wish to speak. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 71 'ayes', 25 'nos'. House Bill 2553 having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2633, out of the record. State and Local Government, Second Reading. House Bill House Bill 760, out of the record. 391, out of the record. House Bill 832, out of the record. House Bill 1078, ο£ the record. House Bill 1538, Representative Marinaro. Out of the record. House Bill 1584. Representative Young. Mr. Clerk, has the Bill been read a second time?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1584...This Bill's been read a second time. Previously the Bill as held for a fiscal note to be filed. The fiscal note is now filed."
- Speaker McPike: "Read the Bill...Representative Younge, do you want to, do you wish to pass the Bill at this time? Yes.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1584, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to township powers. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Younge."
- Younge: "I thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is about a modular housing factory in the East St. Louis Township. Governor Thompson had signed off on this project but the statute in reference to the township was not clear as to whether or not the township could contract with a private firm to

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

manage and to construct the housing factory, and the purpose of the Bill is to clear up this and the township's statute. This Bill is supported by DCCA and all the parties involved."

Speaker McPike: "And on that, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted to this Bill, is that correct?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. With the Amendment, I rise in support of the Sponsor's Bill. Let me just for edification, the, the Sponsor's been working on this for This, this money is coming out of the Build seven years. Illinois Purposes Fund. The Amendment is drafted to answer a problem that she had with the previous Governor who didn't want this money to be under the control of the City of East St. Louis. What she's done is to incorporate the township, which is a co-terminous township, to operate this, that perhaps could be an economic development incentive and measure in her district. I think she's worked very hard on it. The Amendment answers questions that, that any of us had, and we're pleased to rise in support of the Lady's Bill."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 107 'ayes' and 4 'nos'. House Bill 1584 having received a Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Mr. Black, yesterday a number of Bills were moved to Third Reading, and the Chair erred in so They did not have fiscal notes as requested, and they did not have state mandate notes as requested, this time the Chair will return House Bill 7. Representative Black."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Black: "All these Bills that were inadvertently moved, are they all Republican Bills?"

Speaker McPike: "One of them is."

Black: "Well, then, what can I say? The Chair is being eminently fair."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang, LeFlore, Ropp, Preston, Capparelli, Walsh, McGann, Keane, and Curran. That's House Bill 17, House Bill 40, House Bill 143, House Bill 257, House Bill 582, House Bill 612, House Bill 614, House Bill 1195, House Bill 2108, and House Bill 2460 are now on Second Reading. Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I notice that you read House Bill 612, and the House moves that the fiscal note Act was not applicable."

Speaker McPike: "That's correct. You are absolutely correct.

There was also a state mandates note requested, and that was not filed. So that's why that was returned."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Constitutional Officers, Third Reading. Appears
House Bill 262, Representative McNamara. Mr. McNamara.
Read the Bill, Mr....Out of the record. House Bill 303,
Representative McNamara. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 303, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this Bill does is very simply take care of a situation that occurred during the Operation Desert Storm. It allows the veterans who have just come back not...to be able to pay their real estate taxes within one year without penalty or interest. The main reason for this Bill, obviously, is is not to have any undue hardship on, on this, on their families. I urge its approval. I know of no opposition."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Is there any opposition? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Giorgi, 'aye'. Daniels, 'aye'. Giorgi, 'aye'. Anyone else? McCracken, 'aye'. Wyvetter Younge, 'aye'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 115 'ayes' and no 'nays'. House Bill 303 having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 316, Representative Homer. Out of the record. House Bill 1910, Representative Giglio. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1910, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Deposit and State Moneys Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, or Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What this Bill does, it clarifies the language in the statutes that allows the State Treasurer to put money in, in the banks in the community when people who are caught in the so—called middle that, when they have, when there's a flood that they can't receive SBA loans or they can't, or the state is not declared a disaster area in a particular community, and it allows the Treasurer to put the money in a bank so the banks could give it to the people whose homes have been flooded, and they've haven't been able to get a reasonable loan to buy their furnaces or washer and dryer, whatever destruction that they have. I know of no opposition, and I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker McPike: "And on the Motion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Black: "Representative, you know, you have some interesting legislation here, and certainly on the surface we all want to help people whose homes are damaged by floods, but in all honesty, could not the Treasurer do this under the Link Deposit Plan already? I mean, doesn't he have the authority and the means and the wherewithall to do this right now?"

Giglio: "Representative Black, let me read the last sentence of the statute. 'The State Treasurer may in his discretion accept a proposal from an eligible institution which provides a reduced rate of interest provided that such institutional documents the use of deposit funds', here it is, for 'community development projects'. That's it. It doesn't say anything about helping the people. 'Community development projects', and that's the, that's the key where the interpretation is misleading, and that's what we're trying to correct."

Black: "Well, I...I...I can appreciate perhaps wanting a clarification of statute, but I think as you said, the statute says that he can do this, the Treasurer can do this for special purposes, and I would think that the Attorney General and anybody would certainly not come back and say that a flood damage would not be a special purpose under the Link Deposit. I, I think that Treasurer Quinn already has the authority to do this, and in all respect to the Treasurer and in all due respect to the Sponsor, I really think that this is aimed more at publicity than correcting an inequity in current statute, and that's the only reason that I would rise in opposition."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Hultgren, 'aye'. Representative Martinez, 'aye'. Mr.

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Weller would like to change from 'no' to 'aye'. Any others? Mr. Clerk, did you take the record? On this Bill there are 79 'ayes' and 31 'nos'. House Bill 1910 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2108, Representative Keane. Was this Bill amended today, Mr. Clerk?"

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2108. This Bill was returned to Second Reading for a fiscal note today."
- Speaker McPike: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Has the fiscal note been filed? Mr. Keane, Mr. Keane, the Bill's on Second Reading. There's no fiscal note filed. House Bill 2417, Representative Keane. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. House Bill 2418, Mr. Keane. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2418, a Bill for an Act requiring balanced budget notes. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "The, House Bill 2418 is a very simple one. It's an Audit Commission Bill. It creates the Balanced Budget Notes Act. It requires the Economic and Fiscal Commission to write a budget note for supplemental appropriations introduced in each House. So, in other words, when we look at a supplemental appropriation, we will see it in terms of what its impact on the total budget will become and on that basis vote up or down on the appropriation. Be happy to answer any questions and ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker McPike: "On the Gentleman's Motion, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

McCracken: "May this Act be waived by a Constitutional Majority vote? I mean, will this act as a mandates note would act or as a fiscal impact note would act?"

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Keane: "There's nothing in the, there's nothing in the legislation as it's written now to make it, to keep it from being waived."

McCracken: "To what?"

Keane: "It can be waived by a vote under our Rules."

McCracken: "And, will, of course I suppose our House Rules haven't been amended to account for this so there's no requirement that this slow down a Bill on Second Reading while its filing is pending?"

Keane: "The, the budget cannot, the subject matter of the Bill...Let me read the analysis for you. Before Second Reading in the House of introduction the note shall include a reliable estimate of anticipated effects on the state budget for that fiscal year. So, in other words, the budget cannot be requested for Amendments in committee or on the floor. So this budget request would go in the same as anyone else. It does now on the Second Reading."

McCracken: "Okay. This is the Auditor General's suggestion?"

Keane: "No. This is the Audit Commission's."

McCracken: "Audit Commission?"

Keane: "Yes."

McCracken: "Alright, thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The, the only question that I would have is if the Sponsor of this Bill would have me as a Co-Sponsor. I think it's an excellent good, good government Bill, and it's, it's one that we can all support. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Dunn, 'aye'. John Dunn, 'aye'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 115 'ayes' and no 'nays'. House Bill 2418 having received the

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2420, Representative Mautino. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2420, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Illinois State Auditing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
 Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 2420, which a, a financial analysis and, by CMS has been filed which provides for no significant financial impact, does basically one thing. It amends the, the State Audit Act to require that the Auditor General conduct management audits of each department of state government created under the Civil Administrative Code to examine and report upon the productivity of all employees of each department. Each department shall so be audited every four years. That's specifically what it does. There's no significant cost, and it's completed by the Auditor General. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 114 'ayes', and no 'nays'. House Bill 2420 having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2421. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2421, a Bill for an Act in relation to

 State Program Audit Reports. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2421 establishes the state, that state mandated programs are to be audited by the Auditor General in conjunction with the annual fiscal audit report. All new state programs initiated

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

after the effective date of the Act must be audited within five years after the program begins. There was also a, a message for a fiscal note, and from CMS there's no, there's no significant fiscal impact resulting from the legislation, and it's basically an audit for any new program that we established. I move for its adoption and passage."

- Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is,
 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed
 vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The
 Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 109
 'ayes' and no 'nays'. House Bill 2421, having received a
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House
 Bill 2526, Representative Saltsman. Read the Bill, Mr.
 Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2526, a Bill for an Act to amend the Employment Illinois Workers on Public Works Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Yes, this legislation takes effect when there's a high unemployment rate and in the, in the State of Illinois, and it allows us to hire workers from Illinois only and preserve the jobs for our own people. I ask for passage of this Act."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion of the Bill? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 97 'ayes' and 8 'nos'. House Bill 2526 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Younge."
- Younge: "Can House Bill 879 on Second Reading, Economic Development, be called to put an Amendment on? It was

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

taken out of the record."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Younge, we're on Third Reading.

The Chair's gonna stay on Third Reading at this time.

Representative Laurino in the Chair."

Speaker Laurino: "...20 of the Calendar. House Bill 342,

Representative Davis. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 342, a Bill for an Act to amend in Act an relationship to public assistance benefits. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. House Bill 342 is the Bill that allows electronic transfer from the Department of Public Aid to any financial institution that will be handling the recipients' checks or money orders or what have you. This is a piece of legislation that passed out of the House and also the Senate last term. The Governor vetoed and it came back over to the House, and the House overrode the veto. The Senate never got a chance to call the Bill. It passed out of committee I think unanimously, and we would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Laurino: "Any discussion? Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? Is this the Bill you and I talked about last year that alters the Loss Rules in the case of Public Aid checks?"

Davis: "Is does what, now?"

McCracken: "Alters the Loss Rules of the allocation of..."

Davis: "Laws Schools?"

McCracken: "Yeah, if a Public Aid check is forged, isn't this the thing that we're talking about?"

Davis: "Well, it eliminated that by making it an electronic transfer. There is no paper. We talked about the, you were talking about forged checks and the loss of checks.

Well, this eliminates that because the State of Illinois

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

will use an electronic transfer system."

McCracken: "Oh, for all Public Aid transfers?"

Davis: "Yes, Sir."

McCracken: "And the Department..."

Davis: "The Department supports it."

McCracken: "Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Ιf not. Representative Davis moves that House Bill 342 having...moves that everyone voting shall vote 'aye', opposed 'nay'. Have voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill having received 79 'ayes', 33 'nays'. and 3 voting 'present', having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. the Calendar. House Bill 524, Representative Mautino. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 524, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Credit Union Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House 524 addresses two areas of concern to, for example, creditors, as it pertains to credit unions. Under current law. credit unions are not subject to garnishment proceedings, excuse me, concerning the share accounts of those facilities. Banks, savings and loans, and savings banks are under the garnishment provisions. legislation would put the credit unions, banks, savings banks, and savings and loans all under the same garnishment provisions. The Amendment was adopted to also have the, at the request of the credit unions, to amend the Credit Union Record sections so that it is in conformity with the Federal Right to Financial Privacy Act under the U.S., the U.S. Commercial Code Section 34-20, and that's what legislation does. I move for its adoption and passage.

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Happy to answer any questions."

Laurino: "Further discussion. Seeing none. Representative Mautino moves for the adoption of House Bill All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'nay'. The report is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill, having received 106 'ayes', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the required...Representative 'aye'. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Bill 897, Representative Mautino. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 897, House Bill 897, a Bill for an Act to amend the Savings Bank Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Don't do this to me. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 897 is proposal that а was introduced Representative Flinn because Representative Flinn is, of course, tied up. He has asked me to handle legislation on his behalf. Now, I mean he's in, he's in, he's in crutches right now and then both legs busted up. What this legislation does as amended is provide that savings banks shall have all those powers granted to the state savings banks under the FDI, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, rather than all the powers not inconsistent with that Act. As I understand it, this puts the State of Illinois' savings banks in compliance with our existing provisions at the state level and the federal level, and I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Laurino: "Any discussion? Seeing none, Representative Mautino moves for the passage of House Bill 897. All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye'. Opposed vote 'nay'.

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This Bill having received 99 'ayes', 5 voting...6 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 989, Representative Deering. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 989, a Bill for an Act to amend the Credit Card Issuance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What House Bill 989 simply does is says that it provides that cardholders are not required to record their credit card number on a check as a condition of acceptance and it has Amendments that is an exception of, credit card numbers may be recorded when the card issuer guarantees a check of its cardholders and also cardmembers may be required to put numbers on checks when they are used to pay a credit card account. I will be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Laurino: "Any discussion? Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield for questions?"

Deering: "Yes."

Granberg: "Representative, the Bill provides that the provision of a credit card number as a condition of check cashing is prohibited. Why would you do that?"

Deering: "Says what? That's not what I'm reading."

Granberg: "Why, why would you want to prohibit the use of a credit card number as a condition of check cashing?"

Deering: "Well, because right now state law says that they cannot, if the check bounces, they cannot attach the amount to your credit card account, and also there's a lot of credit card fraud going on out there. When anybody gets the number of your credit card, who knows what you might be

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

purchasing by your credit card number?"

Granberg: "Had someone used your credit card previously
 fraudulently, is that...?"

Deering: "No, Sir."

Granberg: "Any establishment in the area that you've left your credit card at, or?"

Deering: "Not that I know of."

Granberg: "Oh, okay. So who gave you this idea for this great legislation?"

Deering: "It's a brilliant piece of legislation thought up by myself."

Granberg: "Well, we...we usually don't have that around here.

That's why I was curious."

Deering: "There's always a first for everything."

Granberg: "Okay....Well, thank you. Is this your first Bill?"

Deering: "Yes, Sir, it is."

Granberg: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Granberg, I don't think this is the, the Gentleman that you wanted...Further discussion. Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Laurino: "Yes."

Weaver: "Representative, our analysis indicates that this Bill seems to be favored by the Community Bankers Association, the Retail Association, the Illinois Bankers Association, and it's also favored by the American Express Company. Do you have an American Express credit card?"

Deering: "No Representative, I do not."

Weaver: "Well, will you get one if this Bill passes?"

Deering: "No, Representative, I will not."

Weaver: "Do you want one?"

Deering: "No, Representative, I do not want one."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Weaver: "So, you don't mind leaving home without it."

Deering: "That's right."

Weaver: "Well, it seems like a pretty decent Bill. I, I don't know why they did this to you on your first Bill, though, it, it's got a lot of baggage with it as your colleague on the Democrat side's already told you. I, I think we might be able to look at this a little bit harder."

Deering: "Well, I would appreciate your consideration."

Weaver: "Well, I, I didn't know you fellows down that far south had credit cards."

Deering: "Just a few of us, and there are quite a few ladies that have credit cards, also."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, have you had a lot of people in your district come to you with complaints about this problem?"

Deering: "Not necessarily."

Lang: "Do you, do you keep their names on index cards or something so you can share them with the rest of us?"

Deering: "No, I do not."

Lang: "And I, the, the real, the real question I have is, I noticed that you're on that side of the aisle, are you, are you misplaced or have you not been able to find your name on the seating chart that's been prepared or what's the deal?"

Deering: "No, this is a fine seat over here. I'm in the middle of everything."

Lang: "You certainly are in the middle of everything, and this is your first Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes. Would the Sponsor yield, please?"

Deering: "Yes."

Novak: "Representative Deering, are there many credit cards

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

- issued in Southern Illinois?"
- Deering: "I believe there are several."
- Novak: "Okay, well you know I'm looking at the wording of one of these Amendments and I was wondering, you know, credit card numbers are quite long. I don't know, they may be 12, 13, 14, 15 numbers. Do you think the numbers might be too long, they might sort of overlap on the check? 'In other words you might have to make your personal check a little bit larger than they are?"
- Deering: "Well, it's possible, it's possible they could get in conflict with the account numbers. That probably could happen."
- Novak: "Okay. Do you realize another thing that might take when you're going through the checkout counter, let's say at a grocery store, and you're buying \$150.00 worth of food for the family and you have maybe 300 or 400 items, that this may delay things and cause traffic jams in grocery stores?"
- Deering: "That's what I'm planning to do, keep from delaying things."
- Novak: "Okay. Just checking. Incidentally, Representative

 Deering does have an open account in various establishments
 in Springfield."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, we, this has been visited once before today. In fact, I think Representative McGann had an Amendment to a Bill that, that I think did the same thing. Did, did you steal this idea from Representative McGann?"
- Deering: "No. I think if the Representative will remember, this is House Bill 989. Representative McGann's was 23 something."
- Black: "Ah hah. As we suspect, south of I-80. You mean the

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Gentleman from Chicago may have borrowed this idea from you?"

Deering: "Very possible."

Black: "Ah...The plot begins to thicken."

Deering: "I haven't approached him on this matter yet."

Black: "Well, you know, somebody over on that side, I think it might have been Representative Granberg, asked if anyone had ever taken your credit card number off of a check, and, I just wanted to ask you, Representative, how big are you?"

Deering: "Bigger than most."

Black: "I was gonna say, anybody that would steal this Gentleman's credit card number is braver than I am. Even though it's his first Bill, I'm not about to argue with this man, I think he has a fine piece of legislation here, and any of you who want to vote against him, I'm sure he'll talk to you afterwards."

Deering: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Deering: "Yes."

Hultgren: "Representative Deering, I am, am not certain as to the application of the Bill in exactly how, how much territory you intend to cover with the prohibition here, and I was just going through my wallet and wondering if you could help me. For example, if the, if the supermarket asks me to put down the number from my library card, would that be prohibited under the, under this Bill?"

Deering: "No, it will not, it just pertains to credit cards."

Hultgren: "If the supermarket asks for the number of my Best Western Gold Crown Club, would that be prohibited under this Bill?"

Deering: "No."

Hultgren: "If the, if the supermarket were to ask for my Walden

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Books Preferred Reader number, would that be prohibited under this Bill?"

Deering: "No, Representative, it just covers credit cards."

Hultgren: "And, and finally, and perhaps most importantly, if the supermarket wanted the number for the Stars and Stripes video card, would that be prohibited under this Bill?"

Deering: "No, Sir, it wouldn't."

Hultgren: "Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Deering: "Yes."

Woolard: "Representative, I am reasonably sure that your intent is to clean up some very necessary language in order to provide some very necessary accommodations to some very necessary northern Legislators who utilize something such as you're talking about. Is that right?"

Deering: "Yes, I am."

Woolard: "This is a corrective measure that you're about, is that right?"

Deering: "Well, I'm, it's, it's sort of corrective and mainly consumer protectionism."

Woolard: "In other words, you're trying to establish yourself as a very credible individual in this Body, is that right?"

Deering: "Well, I would like to accomplish that."

Woolard: "Have you heard anything about a dress code on the Floor of the House?"

Deering: "As I understand, you have to have a tie to get in the Senate."

Woolard: "Have you heard anything about a jacket?"

Deering: "Not to my knowledge."

Woolard: "Are you trying to establish a precedent by standing with your sleeves rolled up before this august Body with your first Bill?"

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Deering: "It just shows that I'm working very hard."

Woolard: "Very good. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Deering moves for the adoption of House Bill 989. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. Voting's open. Now we're gonna close the board and he's gonna come after all of ya. Representative, Representative Hartke would you like to give him further advice on how to pass a Bill?"

Hartke: "Listen, I...I think this is a fantastic piece of legislation. We voted for it a few minutes ago, on a, on a, another piece of legislation which I think, I think this Legislator thought it was so good that he stole it from Representative Deering, and I, I think we owe it to Representative Deering. Actually I'm afraid of him. I mean, Bill Black said he was gonna vote for it, and I'm supposed to keep, to keep track of this guy and so I gotta vote for this fine piece of legislation."

Speaker Laurino: "Well, I think that's do a lot of convincing for all of us. We'll save ya. Representative Deering, it appears that Representative Hartke's pleas are not going unanswered. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill having received 114, 115 'ayes', 0 'nays', 0 voting 'present', having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Deering, congratulations."

Deering: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."

Speaker Laurino: "Page 37 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 1569, Representative Leach. Representative Leach. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1569, a Bill for an Act to amend the

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Electronic Fund Transfer Transmission Facility Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Leach."

Leach: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill simply permits bank holding companies that have, use electronic funds transfer to transfer between affiliates without going through an outside entity. It's not controversial. I know of no opponents and would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Laurino: "...Seeing none, Representative Leach moves for the adoption of House Bill 1569. All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'nay'. Board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill having received 159 (sic 116) 'ayes', 0 'nays', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed...2016, Representative Parke. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2016, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2016 refers to some state banks, especially small ones, which are not able to form holding companies because of the expense. This Bill, under this (sic these) provisions...would allow directors of these banks to consider the impact of their actions without having to form a holding company and become subject to the Illinois Business Corporate Act. This is a Bill that will, is beneficial to the small banks in this state, and it passed out of the Financial Institutions Committee with a unanimous Roll Call, and I would ask the Body to approve

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

this Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion. Seeing Representative Parke moves for the adoption and passage of House Bill 2016. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill, having received 102 'aye', 0 voting 'nay' and 2 received 'present', having the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2135, Representative Santiago. Out of the record. House Bill 2562 on page 44, Representative Harris. the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2562, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2562 allows the establishment of temporary automatic teller machines, or ATMs, at events like fairs or neighborhood gatherings, community festivals, similar type events. It limits the number of ATMs to 2, and it limits the duration to 10 days, which coincides with the length of the State Fair. I ask for your approval of the Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Any discussion? Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Laurino: "Indicates he will."

Weaver: "Representative, will these temporary teller machines, are they still subject to the same distance requirements that the other machines are? That permanent machines would be?"

Harris: "They are...It is the intention that they are not, because they would be established at a State Fair, or a

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

community-neighborhood festival, something along those lines."

Weaver: "Would there be a prohibition, for example, from a bank from a different community bringing in machines to a new community for a temporary nature?"

Harris: "They are subject to the same prohibition that the bank has to be located in, the ATMs have to be used in that county or a contiguous county, which is what the current law reads."

Weaver: "Okay, so those distances do prevail."

Harris: "That's correct."

Weaver: "Alright, thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion. Representative Olson."

Olson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Laurino: "Indicates he will."

Olson: "Representative Harris, I support your Bill, but I have a question which may be a problem. You say that a festival affair or something like that. What if there were 3 or 4 banks in that community and they all chose to take an ATM out there? What..."

Harris: "It's limited to 2, and that's the beauty of the marketplace because they would then compete against each other, and only one would be selected."

Olson: "It's limited to 2?"

Harris: "That's correct."

Olson: "Limited to 2 ATMs, and a festival could say we are going to contract with this particular bank versus the other particular bank, whichever one might offer the best deal for that festival? Let's say it was Springfield, and we had the State Fair adjacent, is it the first 2 on the ground?"

Harris: "No, the organizer of the event, or the Sponsor of the event, would determine which one would be selected, and

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

that could be, indeed, on a competitive basis."

Olson: "Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, Representative Harris moves for the adoption of House Bill 2562. All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill having received 112 'ayes', 1 'nay', 2 voting 'present', having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed...proceed to page 40 on the Constitutional Officers, House Bill 2108, Representative Keane. Is Representative Keane in the chamber? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2108, a Bill for an Act in relationship to compensation of banks by the State Treasurer. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2108 is on the Order of Second Reading. A fiscal note has been filed.

Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2108, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the compensation of banks by State Treasurer. Third Reading of the Bill.

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Keane."

٧.

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2108 directs the State Treasurer to establish a pilot program to provide for paying banks for check clearing services by means other than depositing state funds. It requires a report back to us within one year by March 15, '92, and the Act repeals itself on September 1992. Basically, what we want to know, is whether or not it would be cheaper for the state to pay for the services that are incurred in banking rather than to use compensating balances. Be happy to answer any questions and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Laurino: "Any questions or discussions. Representative

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Laurino: "Indicates he will."

Weaver: "This pilot program will cover how many institutions?"

"It doesn't say. What we're going to do is, the Treasurer can start negotiating. What we found when we went with the Auditor General, the Auditor General used to pre-qualify auditors, and we then went to a bid. The Auditor General bidding process, and it saved the state approximately one-third of the costs of auditing. What we to accomplish by this, is that because we have, what we are doing now and what leads to newspaper stories and kinds of implication that there's some all wrongdoing involved, we give compensating balances. Τn other words, we deposit a lot of money into an account, we don't get any interest on that money, and the public is saying 'Why don't you get interest on the money? Why are you putting money in that bank, and not getting interest on it?' What this gives the Treasurer a chance to do, is to start some competitive bidding among banks to see what kind rates the state can get, and what kind of interest we can get return on, and how much the...start getting the banks to compete as to how much they're going to charge us for compensating balances."

Weaver: "Do we have a ball-park figure? Our analysis indicates that the first-year cost is going to be around a hundred-thousand, but I would assume that that may not take into account the fact that we're now going to have those non-interest bearing accounts bear interest."

Keane: "Well, the...if we pay charges, it'll be a wash, we could actually come out money ahead, and that's the purpose of it, to see how it does work out. If we're collecing

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

interest on that money, rather than allowing the banks to use those compensating, you know, the interest that they theoretically earn, to pay for their costs, the We really don't know whether we're ahead or not. costs. There has been sufficient public outcry, especially in the metropolitan area, where .people have put money into bank accounts without interest, in non-interest-bearing accounts, that it's not a good idea, and this would be, this would give a basis for us to decide whether it's good or bad."

Weaver: "Is this hundred—thousand, is that a limit, or is it stricty wide open at this point in terms of how much the program..."

Keane: "I _don't know where you get the hundred-thousand, is that
 on your staff analysis?"

Weaver: "Yes."

Keane: "I think, if they're saying it cost a hundred—thousand dollars, what they're saying is is that they probably are figuring that the bank charges would be charged, we would be charged a hundred—thousand. They should have also calculated in how much interest would have been earned by the state. We may end up earning a hundred and twenty—thousand in interest."

Weaver: "Well, I just hate to see us even with a pilot program, I hate to see us offer an open-ended situation like this. It may cost a million, it may cost two-million."

Keane: "Well, it's not open-ended. First of all, the Treasurer, as you know, will not do anything, I would hope that being a politician he would not do anything which would give his adversaries cause or things that they could throw at him in the next election. I would think that...Do you want me to wait until you're finished with Representative Klemm? Are you able to hear it, listen? I don't think that the

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Treasurer would abuse this, if he did abuse it he would be open to criticism by both your side of the aisle and our side."

Weaver: "Well, I hope there are some reasonable limits on it.

That's my only concern."

Keane: "And the thing does sunset. The Bill sunsets, so it's not a permanent condition. We will review what the experience is and then decide what we should do about it."

Weaver: "Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Further questions? Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?

Representative Keane, I'm all for lowering the costs of the state, and I applaud you for doing that. I guess I'm a bit curious, in terms of why we're keeping the compensating balances in the first place. Would that be typical of other governmental bodies in the state in order to have financial institutions handle their check—clearing services that they would be required to maintain compensating balances?"

Keane: "I can't hear you, if you could speak a little louder, maybe if we could have a little bit more quiet I could hear what your question was."

Hultgren: "Well, I said I, I said at the outset that I applaud your effort to lower the costs to the state for its banking services, but I am curious even about the current situation. Is it common for other governmental bodies to be required to maintain compensating balances for the financial institutions to provide check clearing services? Is that common, or are we being taken under the current procedure?"

Keane: "No, if you were aware of what's happened in Cook County, we've had some public officials who did not put money into interest bearing accounts and they received a lot of

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

criticism for that, and in case of Cook County, the Cook County Board, in a bipartisan way, has mandated that they want money in interest—bearing accounts, and all we're doing on this is, we're setting up a one—year program to see what would happen with state government. It could be a wash; it could be that what we're doing now is better and it could be that by paying for bank services, we would come out ahead. We really don't know."

- Hultgren: "My question would be, 'Why don't we put the money into interest-bearing accounts, and still get the banking services?' Is there no one willing to do it under those terms?"
- Keane: "No, because it does cost money to run the bank. It does take people and it does, they have to pay off equipment and machinery, and they're not going to do probono for the kind of volume the State of Illinois has."
- Hultgren: "And yet, I would concede there's a substantial volume, but they still would be making the difference between the cost of interest paid and the cost of their money, is that not right? The difference in the interest rate that they pay and the interest in the difference rate that they receive?"
- Keane: "That's what we're trying to determine with this Bill passes. That's hopefully what we will determine in the ensuing year."
- Hultgren: "Well, I have some additional questions, but I don't know that anyone else shares them, so perhaps I can take it up with you afterwards."

Keane: "Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Further questions. Representative Olson."

Olson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Laurino: "Indicates he will."

Olson: "Representative Keane, I think you have a great idea here,

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

and I laud you on it. There was one, will the legislation mandate, if that's the right word, that the checks are deposited into an interest—bearing account? Would there still be chance for, for lack of a better word, abuse?"

- Keane: "No. All this Bill does, is it tells the Treasurer to set up a pilot program, so we can determine whether or not we're going to get big discounts, or whether banks, as Representative Hultgren mentioned, maybe we can get interest and maybe we can get reduced charges because of the great volume of work that we give to banks."
- Olson: "Let me say a little different...The state signs an agreement with a bank or banks for this service and will pay for the service. There could still be the possibility that some checks of sizeable amounts would get deposited into a non-interest-bearing account, rather than interest bearing, or can we mandate that they have to go into interest-bearing?"
- Keane: "Yeah. In the pilot program, it says we will pay you for clearing services and we want the Treasurer to take, use the interest, get interest off of that money. Now what interest he's going to get will depend on what the market is for, where the interest rates are, but the money that's in the pilot program will gain interest, and we'll use the interest to pay off the services of that money."
- Olson: "Okay. I would like to see something, though, that says it has to go into an interest-bearing account. Period. So, we'll..."
- Keane: "I think, by legislative intent, we can put it on the record that I agree with you."
- Olson: "Okay, thank you."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Keane moves for the adoption of House Bill 2108. All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. The board is open. Have

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

)

- all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill, having received 106 'ayes', 0 voting 'nay' and 1 voting 'present', having received the required Constitutional Amount, (sic Majority) is hereby declared passed...Special Order of Business, House Bill 2104, Representative DeJaegher. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of this Bill?"
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2104 is on the Order of Third Reading."

 Speaker Laurino: "Sponsor wishes to take this Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment. Does he have leave?

 Leave is granted, the Bill will return to Second Reading.

 Representative DeJaegher."
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Woolard, DeJaegher and Phelps."
- DeJaegher: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative Woolard has the Amendment on my Bill, and he will explain the Amendment for the General Assembly."
- Woolard: "Basically all we're doing with this Amendment is incorporating the TIF legislation into the Bill which is dealing with tax-increment financing districts and the Enterprise Zone Law as it is now written. We just want to improve the Bill to include both the TIFs and the enterprise zones. Thank you."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative DeJaegher and Woolard move for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 2104. On that, there are some questions, Representative Weaver."
- Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I couldn't hear him very well. Could you please explain that a little bit louder?"
- Woolard: "Yes, Representative Weaver. The Bill as it is now is dealing with prevailing wages for the enterprise zones.

 What it will do with this Amendment is to include TIF districts and the prevailing wage requirements."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Weaver: "Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Wasn't the TIF districts removed from the Bill in committee?"

Woolard: "Yes. Yes, they were."

Wennlund: "What's the purpose of your Amendment then? Was there any agreement with respect to whether or not TIF districts should be removed, in committee?"

Woolard: "The purpose is to restore the TIF legislation back into the Bill. Very simple."

Wennlund: "Was this done with the consent of the Sponsor?"

Woolard: "Yes, it was."

Wennlund: "No further questions."

Speaker Laurino: "Gentleman from Lake, Representative Bill Peterson."

Peterson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Like to ask the Representative a question."

Speaker Laurino: "Indicates he'll answer."

Peterson: "Does this Amendment have the support of the TIF association? Is this supported by the people who form the TIF association, or is this Amendment something that you have worked on your own to develop and to present to this Assembly?"

Wennlund: "This was not a outgrowth of any TIF sponsored body, no."

Peterson: "Well, there is a group called the TIF District
Association, so to the best of your knowledge, they have no
position, or they never contacted you on this Amendment?"

Peterson: "They haven't contacted me, no."

Wennlund: "Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Pedersen: "Yes."

- Regan: "What's the prime reason that we have TIF districts,

 Representative? What's the prime reason?"
- Peterson: "Well, I think it's very simple. We're adding the prevailing wage clause to the TIF districts, which, it's the understanding of everyone involved with TIF legislation now, that the prevailing wage is enacted, but this just clarifies or codifies the law."
- Regan: "No, I asked the question 'What is the primary reason for a TIF district?'"
- Peterson: "Gives tax incentives for spurring the growth of business of development or industries in a particular area."
- Regan: "In other words, create jobs and economic development in a blighted area, is that not true?"
- Peterson: "Very definitely."
- Regan: "Do you think this is going to help business come into that blighted area, or is it going to hurt business coming into that blighted area?"
- Peterson: "I think it'll help tremendously in the area that we dealt with earlier this evening. The Governor presented, or worked with us very closely, on a package that we put together earlier today. We're talking about probably the most unionized, prevailing, wage-oriented county in this state, in Franklin County."
- Regan: "And this is then to remove the prevailing wage, or put the prevailing wage into the TIF districts?"
- Peterson: "Put the prevailing wage into the TIF district."
- Regan: "Well, to the Bill, I think that's exactly the opposite of what you want to intend to do with a TIF district. A TIF district is to help a blighted area, to bring jobs in, to get tax money in after a while, after industry comes in.

 This simply chases business away, and I think it's a

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

horrible Amendment. Obviously, it was removed in committee for that same reason, and I'd advise a no vote, and I'd like to see a Roll Call."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative DeJaegher and Woolard move for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 2104. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Thank you for your...Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Amendment, having received 66 'aye', 46 'nay', one voting 'present' is hereby adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2104, a Bill for an Act to amend the Prevailing Wage Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Out of the record. Special Call for Human Rights. House Bill 317, Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a..."

Speaker Laurino: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 317, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was given to me by the State Association of Police and Fire Commissioners, and they want this on an age—discrimination program. It's been agreed upon with the Human Rights Commission, with the Police and Fire Commission Association State of Illinois, the firefighters union, the Police Benevolents. Everyone has worked very hard on this Bill, and they've came to an agreement on it and we'd like to pass it out here tonight and get it to the Senate so that this can stop court cases to be held against these police and fire commissioners throughout the State of Illinois. Ask for its passage."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

"Representative Saltsman moves for the adoption Speaker Laurino: of House Bill 317. Seeing no discussion, all those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed will indicate by voting 'nay'. The board is open. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill, having received 114 'ayes', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed...to page 29 on the Calendar, Consumer Protection. House Bill 370, Representative McGann. Out of the record. Page 38 of the Calendar, 1762, Representative Schakowsky. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1762, a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Deposit Account Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Speaker Laurino: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Bill 1762 prohibits a financial institution House. from imposing a fee for transactions on ATM machines that would impose a fee higher than would be charged in a paper transaction for that similar customer. A survey done by the United States Public Interest Research Group found that 1 in 4 Illinois banks is now charging for ATM usage at its own facilities, and 45 percent are charging for other facilities. Illinois now has the highest number of banks that are charging for the use of ATMs at their own facilities. The intention of this Bill is not to prohibit banks from charging people from using ATMs, but only to say that they can't charge customers more than for a comparable paper transaction. This is really based on the fact that the financial institutions came to this Body and claimed that ATMs would be much less expensive, and therefore of great benefit to the consumer, and now we're finding that consumers, now having been hooked on the use of ATMs are

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

being charged in many cases exorbitant fees. So, we want the banks to be able to charge what's fair, but not to gouge consumers and I urge passage of House Bill 1762."

Speaker Laurino: "Any discussion? Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Schakowsky: "Yes." .

Wennlund: "What's the genesis of this Bill, Representative?

Where did it come from? Who's proposing this?"

Schakowsky: "This is similar legislation that was introduced last
Session, I believe, by Representative Levin, thought it was
an excellent idea, and I am supporting it along with
consumer organizations."

Wennlund: "Would the Illinois Public Action Council be the one that's proposing this legislation?"

Schakowsky: "They're certainly advocates of this legislation, yes."

Wennlund: "Have you discussed it with the Illinois Public Action Council?"

Schakowsky: "Yes, on occasion I have."

Wennlund: "When was the last time you discussed it with them?"

Schakowsky: "The last time I discussed it with them was when, in testimony in committee."

Wennlund: "Is the Illinois Bankers Association opposed to this legislation?"

Schakowsky: "I'm assuming they are, I don't know."

Wennlund: "How 'bout the Illinois Community Bankers Association?"

Schakowsky: "I don't know."

Wennlund: "The Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies?"

Schakowsky: "I don't know."

Wennlund: "And about Household International?"

Schakowsky: "I don't know."

Wennlund: "If banks are limited in what they can charge for ATM services, they are going to have to pay us off the cost of

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

providing the services to another group of consumers."

- Schakowsky: "Well, that's assuming that the cost of ATM service can't be recovered by the method covered by this Bill, that they can charge the customer whatever they would charge for a comparable paper transaction."
- Wennlund: "So, it doesn't prohibit a bank from taking whatever it costs them to operate an ATM and pass it on to other consumers like senior citizens and credit card holders of that bank, or for check cashing services, or for checking account services. So, ultimately the consumer is going to pay the cost one way or the other because the banks are not going to absorb it."
- Schakowsky: "No, this does allow the banks to recover costs from customers in a manner exactly the same as they would for paper transactions, which they claim in their testimony, before this Body was that those transactions are more costly than ATM transactions."
- Wennlund: "To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is an Illinois

 Public Action Council initiative proposed by the Bill's

 Sponsor's husband, which is opposed by virtually every

 banking group in the State of Illinois. It is not a

 consumer protection Bill, it is not a consumer—oriented

 Bill, it's a Bill that will ultimately end up on the backs

 of other types of consumers, including those of senior

 citizens, and I urge all the Members to vote 'no' on this

 Bill."
- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion. Representative Peterson."

 Pedersen, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is just another attempt of the Illinois Public Action to micro-manage the world. There are all kinds of banks out there providing these services, and if they're charging too high a price, you know, people will go somewhere else, and it is a lot simpler, we don't have to

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

have another law clogging up our books. They're already clogged up enough. Let's just let the free market handle it. They do it better than any kind of government interference. I suggest we vote 'no' on this terrible Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't have the right to rise on a point of personal privilege, because my name wasn't used in debate, but I'm going to take my opportunity to speak to the Bill to address what I think was a violation of the ethics of this chamber. I have a high regard for the Gentleman on the other side who first addressed objections to this Bill, but I think it's completely out of line to challenge a Member's marital status or to raise their spouse's interest in debate. If the Member thinks that they have a, that there's a conflict of interest or anything of that sort, then they should file some sort of formal complaint. I think it's entirely out of order challenge someone's sincerity on a Bill on the basis of their marriage, and I would hope this is the first and last time that that will be done, with respect to this Sponsor and any other Sponsor of this House. Frankly, I think the Lady has a good Bill. I have a, one of these cards that I I'm never charged a fee. I don't know who's charging fees for these services, my bank doesn't charge me a fee, and I haven't heard from any of my bankers indicating that they object to this Bill. So, these ATMs are there for the facilitation and the encouragement of utilization of these banks. Don't kid yourself, they're making money off of these machines, or they wouldn't have them. I think the Lady has a good Bill, it's a consumer Bill, and I hope that we'll all support it."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Young."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

"Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Young, A.: I, too, rise in support of this Bill, and to address a comment made by one of the previous speakers about another law. I'd like to remind this Body that it was a statute that's on the book that allow for these ATM machines anyway. I'd also like to remind the Body that at the time, the promoters of ATMs were here in the General asking permission to install these ATMs. Assembly the proposition that would be cheaper consumers. Now even though they would cost jobs in the banks by replacing tellers with these ATMs, it would be cheaper for consumers, and therefore these ATMs would be good for consumers. Now, we have ATMs charging more the ATM transaction than what happens when you go into the bank and deals with the employees who are still there. think that this is a good Bill, all it says is that you cannot charge more for a transaction that should be cheaper, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion. Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Laurino: "She indicates she'll answer."

Harris: "Representative, if I may, do you have an ATM card? Do you use an ATM card?"

Schakowsky: "Yes, I do."

Harris: "Does your Bank charge a fee?"

Schakowsky: "Not at this time."

Harris: "Well, now your bank doesn't charge a fee. Does anyone
force you to use your ATM card?"

Schakowsky: "No."

Harris: "Does anyone force anybody to use their ATM card?"

Schakowsky: "No, but it was sold to this General Assembly as a cost-saving device. Now that we're all hooked on our ATM cards, they're coming in and rapidly charging us for them."

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

Harris: "Okay, if, I'm assuming you don't feel that person has enough common sense to realize if they start to get charged for an ATM, that they couldn't go to the bank across the street that doesn't charge for an ATM, and open up an account with them. Is that correct?"

Schakowsky: "There are not always that many options for people in terms of shifting banks."

Harris: "Okay, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman from Homer, or excuse me, the Gentleman from Fulton, answered his own argument. He is not charged a fee. The Sponsor of the Bill is not charged a fee. It's called competition. If some banks starts charging a fee, all you have to do is walk across the street to the other bank that charging a fee, and take advantage of theirs. I, unlike apparently the Sponsor, am maybe hooked on ATMs, but I am still have my free will that says, 'If I don't want to pay that fee, I don't have to stick that card in the machine.' Nobody's holding a gun to my head that says I have to stick the card in the machine to get my money. I still have the free will of saying I can go into the bank and avoid the ATM fee. I don't have to use the machine if I don't choose You know, competition is a pretty neat thing. what keeps fees low, it's what keeps them nonexistent, in the case of the Gentleman from Fulton and the Lady from Cook. They are not charged fees. The Bill is not needed, because the marketplace has taken care of it, I think the appropriate vote is a 'no' vote."

Olson: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that even if a fee is charged at some area banks' ATMs, that there is a savings. There is a savings. If that ATM is on a corner in the shopping center you're going to, if that ATM is in your neighborhood, if ATM is in the business district you frequent, it is much easier and cheaper to go to that ATM,

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

pay a small fee, get your cash, do your transactions, than it might be to drive to another community, another suburb, another part of town, in your car, spending money for fuel and taking time. Those are costs that could be associated, and should be associated with the transaction. The ATM is used by those people who are willing to accept the fee, or as previous speakers have said, competition factor will take over. This is needless legislation, I don't think any banks would endorse it, I don't think too many consumer groups who think it through would endorse it. Thank you very much."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none,
Representative Schakowsky has moved for the adoption of
House Bill 1762. Representative Schakowsky. Close.

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is sincerely presented as a consumer protection measure. This will save consumers money. will protect those of us who were sold on ATMs as a cost saving measure, that opportunity to reap the benefits of this new technology. This is a regulated industry we're talking about, and the chances are if 40% of the banks are now charging for ATM usage, that all of the banks are going to be charging. This is not intended to deprive the banks of the amount of money that they deserve. may charge the same as they do for paper transactions. For those senior citizens who are being told they can go around, there is not always another bank across the street, in fact, very often they have to go a long distance, and this would be a real hardship for them to shop the market for another bank. I would urge this Body and indulgence on my first Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Schakowsky moves for the adoption and passage of House Bill 1762. All those in

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

favor indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'.

The board is open. Have all voted who wish? I'm sorry,

Representative Ryder, to explain your vote."

- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote. The Sponsor of the Bill indicates that some of us are hooked on these cards, well, if that's the case, cut up the cards. kind of legislation is going to mean that my hometown, rural community, is not going to get an ATM machine. I'd like the chance to choose whether I can have that habit just like any other consumer should have the choice. We're going to deprive the choice if we allow legislation. We are going to discriminate against those people who want to use it as a convenience. It was sold as a convenience. That's the way it was used. that's what cards, credit cards, ATM cards, that's how they're used. This is not protectionist, this is discriminatory."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative McNamara, explain your vote.

 You have one minute, Sir."
- McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's very important to realize what's happened in this General Assembly. Some three years ago, the bankers came to us, and they said, 'We want the ATM machines. It will be a great deal for you. We will lower costs, and it won't cost the consumer anything.' Here we are three years later, they're starting to raise the costs, and now there's a big objection because we want to regulate those costs. We were sold a bill of goods before, don't be sold a bill of goods now. Vote 'yes' and get this vote over the 36 mark. Let's get her at least a 47; she should get a 100 votes out of this."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Hultgren to explain your vote.

 You have one minute, Sir."
- Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote, and actually an inquiry of the Parliamentarian, I've always

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

been offended by the fact that Pizza Hut charges more for home delivered pizza than eat—in pizza. If I were to propose an Amendment here, would that be germane, to make the price of the pizza for home delivery the same as the eat—in pizza?"

- Speaker Laurino: "Only if you use your Gold Card. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill having received 39 'aye', 48 'no', and 22 'present' fails. Representative Mautino, are you prepared?..Resolutions, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 417, offered by Representative Lou

 Jones. House Resolution 418, offered by Balanoff. House

 Resolution 419, by Matijevich et al. House Resolution

 #420, Pullen et al, and House Resolution 421, offered by

 Representative Walsh."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Joint Resolution 38, offered by Representative Stepan and Ronan."
- Speaker Laurino: "Committee on Assignment. Perfunctory time the Clerk to read the Bills. Representative Matijevich moves that this House now stand Adjourned until tomorrow morning. This House stands Adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow morning. First Special Session will come to The Attendance Roll Call will be used. order. The Attendance Roll Call for the Regular Session for the attendance οf the Special Session. Representative Matijevich moves for the Adjournment of the Special Session #1 to 9:35 tomorrow morning. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', all those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have

43rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1991

it, and the Adjournment Resolution is adopted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative McGann, Chairman from the Committee on Appropriations Education, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 2, 1991, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 243, 373, 377, 378; 'do pass as amended' House Bill 886, 887, and 888; Representative Hicks, Chairman from the committee on Appropriations for Public Safety and Infrastructure, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 1, 1991, reported the sameback with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 207, 384, 640, and 653; 'do pass as amended' House Bills 376, 383, 629, 632, 637, 641, 644, 646. 808, and 1048. Representative Hannig, Chairman from the Committee on Appropriations for General Services, which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 1, 1991, reported back the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 642, 638, 650, 645, 766, 660, 636, 394, 395, 630, 386, 387, 163, 388, 186, 185, 652 and 635; 'do pass as amended' House Bills 631, 643, 649, 545, 651, 639, 505, 319, 736, 581, 393, 1155, and 737. Representative LeFlore, Chairman from the Committee on Appropriations for Human Services to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 2, 1991, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 633, 214, 374, 380, 381, 655, 657, 1917; 'do pass as amended' House Bills 658, 647, 634, and 659."

Clerk O'Brien: "There being no further business, the House now stands Adjourned."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

92/08/26 09:00:42

MAY 02. 1991

HB-0017	DISCUSSED	PAGE	115
HB-0040	DISCUSSED	PAGE	115
HB-0050	THIRD READING	PAGE	69
	THIRD READING	PAGE	82
	SECOND READING	PAGE	83
	HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	84
	THIRD READING	PAGE	85
HB-0101	SECOND READING	PAGE	97
HB-0101	THIRD READING	PAGE	98
HB-0114	SECOND READING	PAGE	35
	HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	37
	DISCUSSED	PAGE	115
	DISCUSSED	PAGE	115
HB-0274	SECOND READING	PAGE	30
HB-0277		PAGE	68
HB-0303	THIRD READING	PAGE	115
HB-0317	THIRD READING	PAGE	144
	SECOND READING	PAGE	24
	THIRD READING	PAGE	122
HB-0391			
		PAGE	3
HB-0518	THIRD READING	PAGE	99
HB-0524		PAGE	123
HB-0582	DISCUSSED	PAGE	115
HB-0612	DISCUSSED	PAGE	115
HB-0614	DISCUSSED	PAGE	115
HB-0703		PAGE	49
	SECOND READING	PAGE	25
	SECOND READING	PAGE	25
	SECOND READING	PAGE	10
HB-0761	SECOND READING	PAGE	2 6
HB-0812	SECOND READING	PAGE	44
HB-0827	RECALLED	PAGE	48
HB-0832	SECOND READING	PAGE	3
H8-0879	SECOND READING	PAGE	45
	OUT OF RECORD		
		PAGE	46
	DISCUSSED	PAGE	121
	SECOND READING	PAGE	46
HB-0897	THIRD READING	PAGE	124
HB-0899	SECOND READING	PAGE	48
HB-0968	THIRD READING	PAGE	101
HB-0970		PAGE	102
HB-0971	THIRD READING	PAGE	103
	THIRD READING		
		PAGE	125
	SECOND READING	PAGE	48
HB-1085		PAGE	23
HB-1097	SECOND READING	PAGE	48
HB-1113	SECOND READING	PAGE	4
HB-1132	SECOND READING	PAGE	47
HB-1135	SECOND READING	PAGE	37
	DISCUSSED	PAGE	115
HB-1309		PAGE	
			31
HB-1309		PAGE	32
HB-1323		PAGE	49
HB-1475	SECOND READING	PAGE	38
HB-1515	HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	33
HB-1522	SECOND READING	PAGE	38
HB-1533	THIRD READING	PAGE	50
HB-1564	SECOND READING	PAGE	34
HB-1569			
	·	PAGE	132
	SECOND READING	PAGE	47
	RECALLED	PAGE	21
HB-1584	THIRD READING	PAGE	113
HB-1592	SECOND READING	PAGE	34
HB-1592	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	34

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002

. . 📏

STATE OF ILLINOIS 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

92/08/26 09:00:42

MAY 02 . 1991

HB-1644	SECOND READING	PAGE	27
HB-1685	THIRD READING	PAGE	104
HB-1685	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	106
HB-1762	THIRD READING	PAGE	145
HB-1776	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HB-1843	THIRD READING	PAGE	57
HB-1843	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	59
HB-1871	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HB-1910	THIRD READING	PAGE	116
	SECOND READING	PAGE	41
	SECOND READING	PAGE	41
	SECOND READING	PAGE	27
	SECOND READING	PAGE	34
	SECOND READING	PAGE	47
	THIRD READING	PAGE	132
	RECALLED	PAGE	39
	SECOND READING	PAGE	39
	SECOND READING	PAGE	43
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	44
	SECOND READING	PAGE	24
	THIRD READING	PAGE	59
	RECALLED	PAGE	141
	THIRD READING	PAGE	67
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	68
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	144
	THIRD READING	PAGE	135
	DISCUSSED	PAGE	115
	SECOND READING	PAGE	30
	SECOND READING	PAGE	23
	HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	23
	SECOND READING	PAGE	27
	THIRD READING	PAGE	106
	SECOND READING	PAGE	29
	RECALLED	PAGE	29
	SECOND READING	PAGE	40
	THIRD READING	PAGE	118
HB-2420	THIRD READING	PAGE	120
	THIRD READING	PAGE	120
HB-2422	SECOND READING	PAGE	35
	DISCUSSED	PAGE	115
HB-2466	SECOND READING	PAGE	29
HB-2473	SECOND READING	PAGE	40
HB-2526	THIRD READING	PAGE	121
HB-2553	THIRD READING	PAGE	107
	THIRD READING	PAGE	133
	SECOND READING	PAGE	44
HB-2595	SECOND READING	PAGE	41
HJR-0038		PAGE	154
HJR-0038	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	153

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MCPIKE	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND HAYES	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - REP. DEERING	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
SPEAKER SATTERTHWAITE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	2
INTRODUCTION - KEN BOYLE	PAGE	2
INTRODUCTION - JOHN MACKOVIC	PAGE	2
SPEAKER MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	57
SPEAKER LAURING IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	122
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	153
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	153
COMMITTEE ON ASSIGNMENT	PAGE	153

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 003

STATE OF ILLINDIS 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

92/08/26 09:00:42

MAY 02 . 1991

SUBJECT MATTER

ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	153
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION	PAGE	153
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	153
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	154
PERFUNCTORY SESSION ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	154